arXiv:1411.5743v1 [math.AP] 21 Nov 2014

The Nirenberg problem and its generalizations: A unified approach

Tianling Jin*, YanYan Li†, Jingang Xiong‡

November 24, 2014

Abstract

Making use of integral representations, we develop a unified approach to establish blow up profiles, compactness and existence of positive solutions of the conformally invariant equations $P_\sigma(v) = Kv^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}$ on the standard unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^n$ for all $\sigma \in (0, n/2)$, where P_σ is the intertwining operator of order 2σ. Finding positive solutions of these equations is equivalent to seeking metrics in the conformal class of the standard metric on spheres with prescribed certain curvatures. When $\sigma = 1$, it is the prescribing scalar curvature problem or the Nirenberg problem, and when $\sigma = 2$, it is the prescribing Q-curvature problem.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
- 1.1 The main problem . . . 2
- 1.2 Conformal geometry and known results . . . 3
- 1.3 Our main results . . . 5

2 Local analysis **9**
- 2.1 Linear integral equations . . . 9
- 2.2 Blow up profiles of solutions of nonlinear integral equations . . . 15
- 2.3 Fine analysis of blow up with a flatness condition . . . 31
- 2.4 Isolated blow up points have to be isolated simple . . . 35

*Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1362525.

†Supported in part by NSF grants DMS-1065971 and DMS-1203961.

‡Supported in part by the First Class Postdoctoral Science Foundation of China (No. 2012M520002) and Beijing Municipal Commission of Education for the Supervisor of Excellent Doctoral Dissertation (20131002701).

3 Global analysis on the sphere **39**
3.1 Finite blow up points and uniform energy bound 40
3.2 Compactness 43

4 Existence **46**
4.1 Positivity of minimizers 46
4.2 Existence for antipodally symmetric functions 48
4.3 Proof of the existence part of Theorem 1.4 52

1 Introduction

1.1 The main problem

Let $\mathbb{S}^n$ be the n dimensional unit sphere endowed with the induced metric $g_{\mathbb{S}^n}$ from $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. For a given continuous function $K \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$, the aim of the paper is to study blow up profiles, compactness and existence of solutions of the equation

$$P_\sigma(v) = c(n,\sigma) K v^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}, \quad v > 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n \tag{1}$$

where $n \geq 2, 0 < \sigma < n/2$, $c(n,\sigma) = \Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\sigma)/\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}-\sigma)$, Γ is the Gamma function and P_σ is an intertwining operator (see, e.g., Branson [13]) of order 2σ as follows :

• P_σ can be viewed as the pull back operator of the σ power of the Laplacian $(-\Delta)^\sigma$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ via the stereographic projection:

$$(P_\sigma(\phi)) \circ F = |J_F|^{-\frac{n+2\sigma}{2n}} (-\Delta)^\sigma (|J_F|^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}} (\phi \circ F)) \quad \text{for } \phi \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^n), \tag{2}$$

where F is the inverse of the stereographic projection and $|J_F|$ is the determinant of the Jacobian of F.

• From a general Lie theoretic point of view, by Branson [13] P_σ has the expression

$$P_\sigma = \frac{\Gamma(B+\frac{1}{2}+\sigma)}{\Gamma(B+\frac{1}{2}-\sigma)}, \quad B = \sqrt{-\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} + \left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)^2}, \tag{3}$$

where $\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $(\mathbb{S}^n, g_{\mathbb{S}^n})$. Let $Y^{(k)}$ be a spherical harmonic of degree $k \geq 0$. Then we have

$$B\left(Y^{(k)}\right) = \left(k + \frac{n-1}{2}\right) Y^{(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad P_\sigma\left(Y^{(k)}\right) = \frac{\Gamma(k+\frac{n}{2}+\sigma)}{\Gamma(k+\frac{n}{2}-\sigma)} Y^{(k)}. \tag{4}$$

- The Green function of P_σ is the spherical Riesz potential, i.e.,

$$P_\sigma^{-1}(f)(\xi) = c_{n,\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \frac{f(\zeta)}{|\xi - \zeta|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}vol_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}(\zeta) \quad \text{for } f \in L^p(\mathbb{S}^n), \tag{5}$$

where $c_{n,\sigma} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n-2\sigma}{2})}{2^{2\sigma}\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(\sigma)}$, $p > 1$ and $|\cdot|$ is the Euclidean distance in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

The equation (1) involves critical exponent because of the Sobolev embeddings. Denote $H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$ as the σ order fractional Sobolev space that consists of all functions $v \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^n)$ such that $(1-\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}})^{\sigma/2} v \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^n)$, with the norm $\|v\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)} := \|(1-\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}})^{\sigma/2} v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^n)}$. The sharp Sobolev inequality on $\mathbb{S}^n$ (see Beckner [10]) asserts that

$$\left(\fint_{\mathbb{S}^n} |v|^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}vol_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} \right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}} \leq \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}-\sigma)}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\sigma)} \fint_{\mathbb{S}^n} v P_\sigma(v) \, \mathrm{d}vol_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} \quad \text{for } v \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n), \tag{6}$$

and the equality holds if and only if v has the form

$$v_{\xi_0,\lambda}(\xi) = \left(\frac{2\lambda}{2 + (\lambda^2 - 1)(1 - \cos dist_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}(\xi, \xi_0))} \right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{S}^n \tag{7}$$

for some $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and positive constant λ, where $\fint_{\mathbb{S}^n} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}^n|} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n}$. The inequality (6) can be proved by using (2) and the sharp Sobolev inequality on $\mathbb{R}^n$ established by Lieb [85]

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u|^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}} \leq \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}-\sigma)}{\omega_n^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}} \Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\sigma)} \|u\|^2_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \text{for } u \in \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{8}$$

where ω_n denotes the area of the n-dimensional unit sphere and $\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the closure of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ under the norm $\|u\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|(-\Delta)^{\sigma/2} u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

1.2 Conformal geometry and known results

Equation (1) and its limiting case ($\sigma = n/2$)

$$P_{n/2} w + (n-1)! = K e^{nw} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n, \tag{9}$$

where

$$P_{n/2} = \begin{cases} \prod_{k=0}^{\frac{n-2}{2}} (-\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} + k(n-k-1)) & \text{for even } n \\ (-\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} + (\frac{n-1}{2})^2)^{1/2} \prod_{k=0}^{\frac{n-3}{2}} (-\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} + k(n-k-1)) & \text{for odd } n, \end{cases}$$

are closely related to several problems in conformal geometry.

(i) The Nirenberg problem ($\sigma = 1$). The classical Nirenberg problem asks: *Which function K on $(\mathbb{S}^n, g_{\mathbb{S}^n})$ is the scalar curvature (Gauss curvature in dimension $n = 2$) of a metric g that is conformal to $g_{\mathbb{S}^n}$?* If we denote $g = e^{2w} g_{\mathbb{S}^n}$, then the problem is equivalent to solving

$$P_1 w + 1 = -\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} w + 1 = K e^{2w} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^2,$$

and

$$P_1 u = -\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} v + c(n) R_0 v = c(n) K v^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n \text{ for } n \geq 3,$$

where $c(n) = (n-2)/(4(n-1)), R_0 = n(n-1)$ is the scalar curvature of $(\mathbb{S}^n, g_{\mathbb{S}^n})$ and $v = e^{\frac{n-2}{2} w}$.

The first work on the problem is by D. Koutroufiotis [79], where the solvability on $\mathbb{S}^2$ is established when K is assumed to be an antipodally symmetric function which is close to 1. Moser [89] established the solvability on $\mathbb{S}^2$ for all antipodally symmetric functions K which is positive somewhere. Without assuming any symmetry assumption on K, sufficient conditions were given in dimension $n = 2$ by Chang and Yang [29] and [30], and in dimension $n = 3$ by Bahri and Coron [6]. Compactness of all solutions in dimensions $n = 2, 3$ can be found in work of Chang, Gursky and Yang [26], Han [61] and Schoen and Zhang [100]. In these dimensions, a sequence of solutions can not blow up at more than one point. Compactness and existence of solutions in higher dimensions were studied by Li in [82] and [83]. The situation is very different, as far as the compactness issues are concerned: In dimension $n \geq 4$, a sequence of solutions can blow up at more than one point, as shown in [83]. There have been many papers on the problem and related ones. Without any attempt to give a complete list of references, one may see, for example, [2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 31, 33, 35, 36, 38, 46, 50, 61, 62, 64, 71, 72, 81, 86, 87, 97, 98, 104, 108, 109] and so on.

(ii) Prescribed Q-curvature problem ($\sigma = 2$). For a smooth compact Riemannian manifold (M, g) of dimension $n \geq 4$, the fourth order conformally invariant *Paneitz operator* and Branson's *Q-curvature* are given by

$$P_2^g = \Delta_g^2 - \mathrm{div}_g(a_n R_g g + b_n Ric_g) d + \frac{n-4}{2} Q_g$$
$$Q_g = -\frac{1}{2(n-1)} \Delta_g R_g + c_n R_g^2 - \frac{2}{(n-2)^2} |Ric_g|^2,$$

where R_g and Ric_g denote the scalar curvature and Ricci tensor of g respectively, and $a_n = \frac{(n-2)^2+4}{2(n-1)(n-2)}$, $b_n = -\frac{4}{n-2}$, $c_n = \frac{n^3-4n^2+16n-16}{8(n-1)^2(n-2)^2}$. As in the Nirenberg problem, the problem of prescribing Q-curvature in the conformal class of $g_{\mathbb{S}^n}$ is reduced to the study of existence of positive solutions to equations (9) and (1) with $\sigma = 2$. On $\mathbb{S}^4$, Moser's type result was obtained by Brendle [15] via a flow method (see also Baird-Fardoun-Regbaoui [8]). Without assuming any symmetry assumptions, sufficient conditions were given by Wei-Xu [103], Brendle [14],

Malchiodi-Struwe [88]. On $\mathbb{S}^n$ of dimension $n \geq 5$, the problem has been studied by Djadli-Hebey-Ledoux [41], Robert [93], Djadli-Malchiodi-Ahmedou [43, 44], Felli [55] and many others. For the constant Q-curvature problem on general Riemannian manifolds and related work, one may refer to Chang-Yang [32], Chang-Gursky-Yang [27], Esposito-Robert [51], Hebey-Robert-Wen [70], Qing-Raske [92], Djadli-Malchiodi [42], Ndiaye [90], Weinstein-Zhang [105], Hebey-Robert [69], Li-Li-Liu [80], Gursky-Malchiodi [60], Hang-Yang [65, 66, 67] and the references therein.

(iii) Prescribed higher order and fractional order curvature problems. Higher order and fractional order conformally invariant differential (or pseudodifferential) operators on Riemannian manifolds have also been studied. In [58], Graham, Jenne, Mason and Sparling constructed a sequence of conformally invariant elliptic operators, which are called GJMS operators nowadays, based on ambient metric construction of Fefferman-Graham [53]. Recently, an explicit formula and a recursive formula for GJMS operators and Q-curvatures have been found by Juhl [77, 78] (see also Fefferman-Graham [54]). In [59], Graham and Zworski introduced a family of fractional order conformally invariant operators on the conformal infinity of asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds via scattering theory, where the operators P_σ (or more precisely, $P_\sigma^{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}$) on $\mathbb{S}^n$ in equations (1) and (9) are the most typical examples. Some new interpretation and properties of those fractional operators and their associated fractional Q-curvatures were later given by Chang-González [25] and Case-Chang [22], which also provide geometric interpretation of the extension formulations for fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^\sigma$ established by Caffarelli-Silvestre [20] when $\sigma \in (0,1)$ and by R. Yang [107] when $\sigma > 1$.

Prescribing such fractional Q-curvature of order 2σ on $\mathbb{S}^n$ can be considered as generalizations and extensions of the Nirenberg problem and the prescribed Q-curvature problem. One may see the work of, among many others, Escobar [47], Chang-Xu-Yang [28], Escobar-Garcia [48], Han-Li [63], Djadli-Malchiodi-Ahmedou [45] for $\sigma = 1/2$; Jin-Li-Xiong [73, 74], Chen-Liu-Zheng [34], Fang [52], Abdelhedi-Chtioui-Hajaiej [1] for $\sigma \in (0,1)$; Wei-Xu [102, 103], Brendle [14], Chen-Xu [39], Baird-Fardoun-Regbaoui [9] for $2 < \sigma = n/2$; and Zhu [110] for $\sigma > n/2$ in terms of integral equations. Other work which are closely related to these fractional Q-curvatures includes: prescribing fractional order curvature problems on general manifolds by Qing-Raske [91], González-Mazzeo-Sire [56], González-Qing [57]; fractional Yamabe flows and weighted trace inequalities by Jin-Xiong [75, 76]; analysis of local solutions of (1) near isolated singularities by Caffarelli-Jin-Sire-Xiong[19]; some Liouville theorem for indefinite fractional problem by Chen-Zhu [40]; etc.

1.3 Our main results

This paper is devoted to equation (1) for all

$$\sigma \in (0, n/2).$$

First of all, equation (1) is not always solvable. Indeed, we have the Kazdan-Warner type obstruction: For any conformal Killing vector field X on $\mathbb{S}^n$, there holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} (\nabla_X K) v^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}vol_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} = 0 \tag{10}$$

for any solution v of (1), see [12] and [106]. Hence, if $K(\xi) = \xi_{n+1} + 2$ for example, then equation (1) has no positive solutions.

Definition 1.1. *For $d > 0$, we say that $K \in C(\mathbb{S}^n)$ has flatness order greater than d at a point $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^n$ if, in a geodesic coordinate system $\{y_1, \cdots, y_n\}$ centered at ξ, there exists a neighborhood $\mathscr{O}$ of 0 such that $K(y) = K(0) + o(|y|^d)$ in $\mathscr{O}$.*

Theorem 1.2. *Let $n \geq 2$, $0 < \sigma < n/2$, and $K > 0$ be a continuous antipodally symmetric function on $\mathbb{S}^n$, i.e., $K(\xi) = K(-\xi)\ \forall\, \xi \in \mathbb{S}^n$. If there exists a maximum point of K at which K has flatness order greater than $n - 2\sigma$, then* (1) *has at least one positive solution in $C^{2\sigma^*}$, where $\sigma^* = \sigma$ if $2\sigma \notin \mathbb{N}^+$ and otherwise $0 < \sigma^* < \sigma$.*

As we mentioned before, Theorem 1.2 was known for σ in some regions: see Escobar-Schoen [49] for $\sigma = 1$, Djadli-Hebey-Ledoux [41] for $\sigma = 2$, Robert [94] for σ being other integers, and Jin-Li-Xiong [74] for $0 < \sigma < 1$. If K is C^1 and $n - 2\sigma \leq 1$, then at its maximum points K automatically has flatness order greater than $n - 2\sigma$. Therefore, we have

Corollary 1.3. *Suppose $(n-1)/2 \leq \sigma < n/2$. Then for any antipodally symmetric positive function $K \in C^1$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$, equation* (1) *has a $C^{2\sigma^*}$ solution.*

In the next theorem, we consider the functions K of the following form (without symmetry assumptions): for any critical point ξ_0 of K, in some geodesic normal coordinates $\{y_1, \cdots, y_n\}$ centered at ξ_0, there exist some small neighborhood $\mathscr{O}$ of 0 and positive constant $\beta = \beta(\xi_0)$ such that

$$K(y) = K(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j |y_j|^\beta + R(y) \quad \text{in } \mathscr{O}, \tag{11}$$

where $R(y) \in C^{[\beta]-1,1}(\mathscr{O})$ satisfies $\sum_{s=0}^{[\beta]} |\nabla^s R(y)||y|^{-\beta+s} \to 0$ as $y \to 0$ and $[\beta]$ is the integer part of β.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $0 < \sigma < n/2$. Suppose that $K \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^n)$ ($K \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ if $0 < \sigma \leq 1/2$) is a positive function satisfying that for any critical point ξ_0 of K, in some geodesic normal coordinates $\{y_1, \cdots, y_n\}$ centered at ξ_0, there exist some small neighborhood $\mathscr{O}$ of 0 and positive constants $\beta = \beta(\xi_0) \in (n - 2\sigma, n)$, $\gamma \in (n - 2\sigma, \beta]$ such that $K \in C^{[\gamma],\gamma-[\gamma]}(\mathscr{O})$ satisfying* (11) *with $a_j = a_j(\xi_0) \neq 0$ for every j and $\sum_{j=1}^n a_j \neq 0$. If*

$$\sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{S}^n \text{ such that } \nabla_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} K(\xi) = 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^n a_j(\xi) < 0} (-1)^{i(\xi)} \neq (-1)^n,$$

where

$$i(\xi) = \#\{a_j(\xi) : \nabla_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} K(\xi) = 0, a_j(\xi) < 0, 1 \le j \le n\},$$

then (1) *has at least one* C^2 *positive solution. Moreover, there exists a positive constant* C *depending only on* n, σ *and* K *such that for all positive* C^2 *solutions* v *of* (1)*,*

$$1/C \le v \le C \quad \textit{and} \quad \|v\|_{C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)} \le C.$$

For $\sigma = 1, n = 3$, the existence part of the above theorem was established by Bahri and Coron [6], and the compactness part were proved in Chang, Gursky and Yang [26] and Schoen and Zhang [100]. For $\sigma = 1, n \ge 4$, the above theorem was proved by Li [82]. For $\sigma = 2$ and $n \ge 5$, it was proved by Djadli-Malchiodi-Ahmedou [43, 44] and Felli [55]. For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, it was recently proved by Jin-Li-Xiong [73, 74].

Definition 1.5. *For any real number* $\beta > 1$*, we say that a sequence of functions* $\{K_i\}$ *satisfies condition* $(*)'_\beta$ *for some sequence of constants* $L(\beta, i)$ *in some region* Ω_i*, if* $\{K_i\} \in C^{[\beta],\beta-[\beta]}(\Omega_i)$ *satisfies*

$$[\nabla^{[\beta]} K_i]_{C^{\beta-[\beta]}(\Omega_i)} \le L(\beta, i),$$

and, if $\beta \ge 2$*, that*

$$|\nabla^s K_i(y)| \le L(\beta, i) |\nabla K_i(y)|^{(\beta-s)/(\beta-1)},$$

for all $2 \le s \le [\beta]$*,* $y \in \Omega_i$*,* $\nabla K_i(y) \ne 0$*.*

Note that the function K in Theorem 1.4 satisfies $(*)'_\beta$ condition.

Theorem 1.6. *Let* $n \ge 2$ *and* $0 < \sigma < n/2$*, and* $K \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *(*$K \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *if* $0 < \sigma \le 1/2$*) be a positive function. If there exists some constant* $d > 0$ *such that* K *satisfies* $(*)'_{(n-2\sigma)}$ *for some constant* $L > 0$ *in* $\Omega_d := \{\xi \in \mathbb{S}^n : |\nabla_{g_0} K(\xi)| < d\}$*, then for any positive solution* $v \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *of* (1)*,*

$$\|v\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)} \le C, \tag{12}$$

where C *depends only on* $n, \sigma, \inf_{\mathbb{S}^n} K > 0, \|K\|_{C^1(\mathbb{S}^n)} (\|K\|_{C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)}$ *if* $0 < \sigma \le \frac{1}{2}), L,$ *and* d*.*

The above theorem was proved by Schoen-Zhang [100] for $n = 3$ and $\sigma = 1$, by Li [82] for $n \ge 4$ with $\sigma = 1$, by Jin-Li-Xiong [73] for $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, and by Djadli-Malchiodi-Ahmedou [43, 44] and Felli [55] for $\sigma = 2$.

Theorem 1.7. *Let* $n \ge 2$ *and* $0 < \sigma < n/2$*. Suppose that* $\{K_i\} \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *(*$K \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *if* $0 < \sigma \le 1/2$*) is a sequence of positive functions with uniform* C^1 *(*$C^{1,1}$ *if* $0 < \sigma \le 1/2$*) norm and* $1/A_1 \le K_i \le A_1$ *on* $\mathbb{S}^n$ *for some* $A_1 > 0$ *independent of* i*. Suppose also that* $\{K_i\}$ *satisfying* $(*)'_\beta$ *condition for some constants* $\beta \in (n - 2\sigma, n)$*,* $L, d > 0$ *in* Ω_d*. Let* $\{v_i\} \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *be a sequence of corresponding positive solutions of* (1) *and* $v_i(\xi_i) = \max_{\mathbb{S}^n} v_i$ *for some* ξ_i*. Then, after passing to a subsequence,* $\{v_i\}$ *is either bounded in* $L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *or blows*

up at exactly one point in the strong sense: There exists a sequence of Möbius diffeomorphisms $\{\varphi_i\}$ *from* $\mathbb{S}^n$ *to* $\mathbb{S}^n$ *satisfying* $\varphi_i(\xi_i) = \xi_i$ *and* $|\det \mathrm{d}\varphi_i(\xi_i)|^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}} = v_i^{-1}(\xi_i)$ *such that*

$$\|T_{\varphi_i} v_i - 1\|_{C^0(\mathbb{S}^n)} \to 0, \quad \text{as } i \to \infty,$$

where $T_{\varphi_i} v_i := (v \circ \varphi_i)|\det \mathrm{d}\varphi_i|^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}}$.

For $\sigma = 1, n = 3$, the above theorem was established by Chang-Gursky-Yang [26] and by Schoen and Zhang in [100]. For $\sigma = 1, n \geq 4$, the above theorem was proved by Li [82]. For $\sigma = 2$, it was proved by Djadli-Malchiodi-Ahmedou [43, 44] and Felli [55]. For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, the above theorem was proved by Jin-Li-Xiong [73].

By the stereographic projection and Green's representation, we write equation (1) as the form

$$u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K(y) u(y)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y. \tag{13}$$

If $K = 1$, it follows from Chen-Li-Ou [37] or Li [84] that u has to be of the form

$$c \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda^2 |x - x_0|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}, \quad \text{for } c, \lambda > 0, \ x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

which we call a bubble for λ large.

The main idea of our unified approach for all $\sigma \in (0, n/2)$ is to carry out blow up analysis as in Schoen-Zhang [100] and Li [82] for nonnegative solutions of the nonlinear integral equation (13) without using extension formulations for the fractional Laplacian, where some brief descriptions are as follows. In Section 2, we first establish some local estimates and Harnack inequality for nonnegative solutions of linear integral equations. Then we consider positive solutions of nonlinear integral equations with an isolated simple blow up point (Definition 2.9). We prove that those solutions are close to some bubbles in C^2 norm in a small neighborhood of the blow up point (Proposition 2.11) and satisfy a sharp upper bound in a ball with fixed size (Proposition 2.17). At last, given some flatness condition on K, we are able to show that isolated blow up points have to be isolated simple blow up points. All the analysis techniques for integral equations needed in this paper are developed. In Section 3, we follow the arguments of Li [82] and prove our compactness results: Theorem 1.6, Theorem 1.7 and the compactness part of Theorem 1.4. In Section 4, we prove our existence results: Theorem 1.2 and the existence part of Theorem 1.4.

Acknowledgements: Part of this work was done while J. Xiong was visiting Université Paris VII and Université Paris XII in November 2013 through a Sino-French research program in mathematics. He would like to thank Professors Yuxin Ge and Xiaonan Ma for the arrangement. He also thanks Professor Gang Tian for his support and encouragement. T. Jin would like to thank Professors Henri Berestycki and Luis Silvestre for their support and encouragement. The authors thank Professor Hongjie Dong for suggesting the current proof of Proposition 2.3.

2 Local analysis

2.1 Linear integral equations

The regularity properties and local estimates of nonnegative solutions of Schrödinger equation $-\Delta u+Vu=0$ play important roles in the study of the Nirenberg problem and Yamabe problem. In this subsection, we will develop similar results for linear integral equations.

The first result was proved in Li [84], which is a Brezis-Kato [16] type estimate.

Theorem 2.1 (Theorem 1.3 in [84]). *For $n \geq 1, 0 < \sigma < n/2$, and $\nu > r > n/(n-2\sigma)$, there exist positive constants $\bar{\delta} < 1$ and $C \geq 1$, which depend only on n, σ, r and ν, such that for every $0 \leq V \in L^{n/2\sigma}(B_3)$ with $\|V\|_{L^{n/2\sigma}(B_3)} \leq \bar{\delta}$, $h \in L^{\nu}(B_2)$, and $0 \leq u \in L^r(B_3)$ satisfying*

$$u(x) \leq \int_{B_3} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h(x) \quad x \in B_2, \tag{14}$$

we have $u \in L^{\nu}(B_1)$ and

$$\|u\|_{L^{\nu}(B_1)} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^r(B_3)} + \|h\|_{L^{\nu}(B_2)}).$$

Consequently, we have

Corollary 2.2. *For $n \geq 1, 0 < \sigma < n/2$, $r > n/(n-2\sigma)$ and $p > n/2\sigma$, let $0 \leq V \in L^p(B_3)$, $h \in L^{\infty}(B_2)$ and $0 \leq u \in L^r(B_3)$ satisfy* (14)*. Then $u \in L^{\infty}(B_1)$ and*

$$\|u\|_{L^{\infty}(B_1)} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^r(B_3)} + \|h\|_{L^{\infty}(B_2)}),$$

where C depends only on n, σ, r, p and an upper bound of $\|V\|_{L^p(B_3)}$. Moreover, if in addition that $h \in C^0(B_1)$ and it satisfies

$$u(x) = \int_{B_3} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h(x) \quad \text{in } B_2, \tag{15}$$

then $u \in C^0(B_1)$.

Proof. The first part follows from Theorem 2.1 directly. For the second part, if $u \in L^{\infty}(B_1)$, then

$$\int_{B_3} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y = \int_{B_1} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{B_3\setminus B_1} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y$$

is continuous in B_1. Since $h \in C^0(B_1)$, then it follows from (15) that $u \in C^0(B_1)$. □

The next result is about a Harnack inequality for the integral equation (15).

Proposition 2.3. *For $n \geq 1, 0 < \sigma < n/2$, $r > n/(n-2\sigma)$ and $p > n/2\sigma$, let $0 \leq V \in L^p(B_3)$, $0 \leq h \in C^0(B_2)$ and $0 \leq u \in L^r(B_3)$ satisfy* (15)*. If there exists a constant $c_0 \geq 1$ such that $\max_{\overline{B}_1} h \leq c_0 \min_{\overline{B}_1} h$, then*

$$\max_{\overline{B}_1} u \leq C \min_{\overline{B}_1} u,$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ, c_0, p and an upper bound of $\|V\|_{L^p(B_3)}$.

Proof. For any fixed $1 < s < \frac{n}{n-2\sigma}$ and $t > 1$ satisfying $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{t} = 1$, we can choose $0 < \delta < 1$ such that for any $x \in B_2$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_\delta(x)} |x-y|^{2\sigma-n} V(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq \|V\|_{L^p(B_\delta(x))} \| |x-\cdot|^{2\sigma-n} \|_{L^s(B_\delta(x))} |B_\delta|^{1/t} \\ &< 1/2. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Meanwhile, by Corollary 2.2 and standard translation arguments, u is continuous in $B_{3/2}$.

To illustrate the method, we first consider the simplest case by assuming that $u(0) = \max_{\overline{B}_1} u$ and $u(\bar{x}) = \min_{\overline{B}_1} u$ for some $\bar{x} \in \overline{B}_1$. By the equation (15) of u and Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(0) &= \int_{B_3} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h(0) \\ &\leq u(0) \int_{B_\delta} \frac{V(y)}{|y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{B_3 \setminus B_\delta} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h(0) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}u(0) + \int_{B_3 \setminus B_\delta} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + c_0 h(\bar{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\bar{x}-y|^{n-2\sigma}/|y|^{n-2\sigma} \leq C_0(n,\sigma,\delta) < \infty$ for $y \in B_3 \setminus B_\delta$. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2}u(0) \leq C_0 \int_{B_3 \setminus B_\delta} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|\bar{x}-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + c_0 h(\bar{x}) \leq (C_0 + c_0) u(\bar{x}).$$

In general, let

$$M_k = \max_{\overline{B}_{1-2^{-k}}} u, \quad m_k = \min_{\overline{B}_{1-2^{-k}}} u$$

Since u is continuous, we may assume $M_k = u(z_k')$ and $m_k = u(z_k'')$ for $z_k', z_k'' \in \overline{B}_{1-1/2^k}$. By

the equation (15) of u and Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&M_k - h(z_k') \\
&= u(z_k') - h(z_k') \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(z_k')\cap B_{1-1/2^{k+1}}} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{B_3\setminus(B_\delta(z_k')\cap B_{1-1/2^{k+1}})} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(z_k')\cap B_{1-1/2^{k}}} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{B_\delta(z_k')\cap (B_{1-1/2^{k+1}}\setminus B_{1-1/2^{k}})} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\quad + \int_{B_3\setminus(B_\delta(z_k')\cap B_{1-1/2^{k+1}})} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\le \frac{M_k}{2} + \frac{c_1}{2}2^{-(k+1)\varepsilon}M_{k+1} + \int_{B_3\setminus(B_\delta(z_k')\cap B_{1-1/2^{k+1}})} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{t}$ for $t > 1$ in (16) and c_1 is a positive constant depending on n, σ, p, an upper bound of $\|V\|_{L^p(B_2)}$ and the s, t in (16). Thus,

$$\int_{B_3\setminus(B_\delta(z_k')\cap B_{1-1/2^{k+1}})} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h(z_k') \ge \frac{1}{2}(M_k - c_1 2^{-(k+1)\varepsilon}M_{k+1}).$$

By the equation, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
m_k &= u(z_k'') \\
&\ge \int_{B_3\setminus(B_\delta(z_k')\cap B_{1-1/2^{k+1}})} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k''-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h(z_k'') \\
&\ge \int_{B_3\setminus(B_\delta(z_k')\cap B_{1-1/2^{k+1}})} \frac{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}{|z_k''-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + \frac{1}{c_0}h(z_k') \\
&\ge 2c_2 2^{-(k+1)(n-2\sigma)}\left(\int_{B_3\setminus(B_\delta(z_k')\cap B_{1-1/2^{k+1}})} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h(z_k')\right) \\
&\ge c_2 2^{-(k+1)(n-2\sigma)}(M_k - c_1 2^{-(k+1)\varepsilon}M_{k+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|z_k'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}{|z_k''-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \ge 2c_2 2^{-(k+1)(n-2\sigma)} \quad &\forall\, y \in B_3 \setminus (B_\delta(z_k') \cap B_{1-1/2^{k+1}}) \\
\frac{1}{c_0} \ge 2c_2 2^{-(k+1)(n-2\sigma)} \quad &
\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_2 > 0$ depending only on n, σ, δ and c_0. Hence, we have

$$m_k \geq c_2 2^{-(k+1)(n-2\sigma)}(M_k - c_1 2^{-(k+1)\varepsilon} M_{k+1}).$$

We then multiply it by $2^{(k+1)(n-2\sigma)-\varepsilon k(k+1)/2} c_1^k$ and sum in k, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{(k+1)(n-2\sigma)-\varepsilon k(k+1)/2} c_1^k m_k \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_2 \left(2^{-\varepsilon k(k+1)/2} c_1^k M_k - 2^{-\varepsilon(k+1)(k+2)/2} c_1^{k+1} M_{k+1}\right).$$

The right-hand side equals to $c_1 c_2 2^{-\varepsilon} M_1$, and the left-hand side is that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{(k+1)(n-2\sigma)-\varepsilon k(k+1)/2} c_1^k m_k \leq m_1 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{(k+1)(n-2\sigma)-\varepsilon k(k+1)/2} c_1^k \leq C m_1.$$

Therefore, the Harnack inequality is proved. □

Remark 2.4. *In the proof of Proposition 2.3, the constant C in Harnack inequality will be unchanged if the integral domain B_3 is replaced by any open set Ω with $B_3 \subset \Omega$. Also $|x-y|^{2\sigma-n}$ can be replaced by a kernel function $G(x,y)$ which satisfies $G(x,y) = G(y,x)$*

$$\Lambda^{-1} \leq |x-y|^{n-2\sigma} G(x,y) \leq \Lambda, \quad |\nabla_x G(x,y)| \leq \Lambda |x-y|^{2\sigma-n-1}$$

for some constant $\Lambda \geq 1$.

We will have Hölder estimates of u satisfying (15) if h is in addition Hölder continuous.

Proposition 2.5. *For $n \geq 1, 0 < \sigma < n/2$, $r > n/(n-2\sigma)$, $p > n/2\sigma$ and $\bar{\alpha} \in (0,1)$, let $0 \leq V \in L^p(B_3)$, $h \in C^{\bar{\alpha}}(B_2)$ and $0 \leq u \in L^r(B_3)$ satisfy (15). Then $u \in C^{\alpha}(B_1)$ and*

$$\|u\|_{C^{\alpha}(B_1)} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^r(B_3)} + \|h\|_{C^{\bar{\alpha}}(B_2)}),$$

where $C > 0$ and α depends only on $n, \sigma, c_0, p, \bar{\alpha}$ and an upper bound of $\|V\|_{L^p(B_3)}$.

Proof. It follows from Corollary 2.2 that

$$\|u\|_{L^{\infty}(B_{1.9})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^r(B_3)} + \|h\|_{L^{\infty}(B_2)}).$$

For $x, z \in B_1$ satisfying $|x-z| < 1/8$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) - u(z) &= \int_{B_1(x)\cap B_1(z)} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} - \frac{1}{|z-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\right) V(y)u(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\quad + \int_{B_3\setminus(B_1(x)\cap B_1(z))} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} - \frac{1}{|z-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\right) V(y)u(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\quad + h(x) - h(z) \\ &= I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

By the mean value theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|II| &\le C|x-z| \int_{B_3\setminus(B_1(x)\cap B_1(z))} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma+1}}\right) V(y)u(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\le C|x-z| \int_{B_3\setminus(B_1(x)\cap B_1(z))} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\right) V(y)u(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\le C|x-z|(u(x)-h(x)) \\
&\le C(\|u\|_{L^r(B_3)} + \|h\|_{L^\infty(B_2)})|x-z|.
\end{aligned}$$

For III, we have

$$|III| \le \|h\|_{C^{\bar\alpha}(B_1)}|x-z|^{\bar\alpha}.$$

To estimate I, we split the integral into the following four subdomains:

$$\begin{aligned}
U_1 &:= B_1(x)\cap B_1(z)\cap\{y : |y-x| < |x-z|/2\} \\
U_2 &:= B_1(x)\cap B_1(z)\cap\{y : |y-z| < |x-z|/2\} \\
U_3 &:= B_1(x)\cap B_1(z)\cap\{y : |y-z| > |y-x| > |x-z|/2\} \\
U_4 &:= B_1(x)\cap B_1(z)\cap\{y : |y-x| > |y-z| > |x-z|/2\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$I = \sum_{i=1}^4 \int_{U_i} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} - \frac{1}{|z-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\right) V(y)u(y)\,\mathrm{d}y := I_1+I_2+I_3+I_4.$$

For I_1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\le \int_{U_1} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\right) V(y)u(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\le \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{1.9})}\|V\|_{L^p(U_1)}\||x-y|^{2\sigma-n}\|_{L^s}|U_1|^{1/t} \\
&\le C\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{1.9})}\|V\|_{L^p(B_3)}|x-z|^{\frac{n}{t}}
\end{aligned}$$

for some fixed $1 < s < \frac{n}{n-2\sigma}$ and $t > 1$ satisfying $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{s}+\frac{1}{t} = 1$, where in the second inequality we used Hölder inequality. Similarly,

$$|I_2| \le C\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{1.9})}\|V\|_{L^p(B_3)}|x-z|^{\frac{n}{t}}.$$

For I_3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_3| &\le C\int_{U_3} \left(\frac{|x-z|}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma+1}}\right) V(y)u(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\le C|x-z|^\beta \int_{U_3} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma+\beta}}\right) V(y)u(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\le C|x-z|^\beta\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{1.9})}\|V\|_{L^p(U_3)}\||x-y|^{2\sigma-n-\beta}\|_{L^{\bar s}}|U_3|^{1/\bar t} \\
&\le C\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{1.9})}\|V\|_{L^p(B_3)}|x-z|^\beta
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\beta > 0$ small, $1 < \bar{s} < \frac{n}{n-2\sigma+\beta}$ and $\bar{t} > 1$, since $p > \frac{n}{2\sigma}$. Similarly,

$$|I_4| \le C\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{1.9})}\|V\|_{L^p(B_3)}|x-z|^\beta.$$

Thus, the Hölder estimate of u follows. □

Let us consider nonnegative solutions of the integral equation

$$u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \quad a.e \text{ in } B_3, \tag{17}$$

where $0 < \sigma < n/2$.

Theorem 2.6. *For $n \ge 1, 0 < \sigma < n/2$, $r > n/(n-2\sigma)$ and $p > n/2\sigma$, let $0 \le V \in L^p(B_3)$, $0 \le u \in L^r(B_3)$ and $0 \le Vu \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. If u satisfies* (17)*, then $u \in C^\alpha(B_1)$,*

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(B_1)} \le C\|u\|_{L^r(B_3)}, \tag{18}$$

and u satisfies the Harnack inequality

$$\max_{\bar{B}_1} u \le C \min_{\bar{B}_1} u, \tag{19}$$

where $C > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$ depend only on n, σ, p, and an upper bound of $\|V\|_{L^p(B_3)}$.

Proof. For $x \in B_2$, set

$$h(x) = \int_{B_3^c} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Then

$$u(x) = \int_{B_3} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h(x).$$

Let x_0 be a point $\bar{B}_1$ such that

$$u(x_0) \le \frac{1}{|B_1|}\|u\|_{L^1(B_1)}.$$

Since $uV \ge 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we have, for $x \in B_2$,

$$h(x) = \int_{B_3^c} \frac{|x_0-y|^{n-2\sigma}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \frac{V(y)u(y)}{|x_0-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \le 4^{n-2\sigma}h(x_0) \le 4^{n-2\sigma}u(x_0) \le \frac{4^{n-2\sigma}}{|B_1|}\|u\|_{L^1(B_1)}.$$

By the same argument, we can show that

$$\max_{\bar{B}_1} h \le 4^{n-2\sigma} \min_{\bar{B}_1} h,$$

and for every $k = 1, 2, \ldots$

$$\|h\|_{C^k(B_2)} \le C(k)\|u\|_{L^1(B_3)}. \tag{20}$$

Hence, this theorem follows from Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.5. □

We also have Schauder type estimates.

Theorem 2.7. *In addition to the assumptions in Theorem 2.6, we assume that $V \in C^{\alpha}(B_3)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ but not an integer, then $u \in C^{2\sigma+\alpha'}(B_1)$ and*

$$\|u\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha'}(B_1)} \le C\|u\|_{L^r(B_3)},$$

where $\alpha' = \alpha$ if $2\sigma + \alpha \notin \mathbb{N}^+$, otherwise α' can be any positive constant less than α. Here $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ, α and an upper bound of $\|V\|_{C^{\alpha}(B_3)}$.

Proof. Let η be a nonnegative smooth cut-off function supported in $B_{2.5}$ such that $\eta \equiv 1$ in B_2. Then

$$u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\eta(y)V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{(1-\eta(y))V(y)u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y := I + II \quad a.e \text{ in } B_3,$$

It is clear that

$$\|II\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha'}(B_1)} \le C\|u\|_{L^{\infty}(B_{2.5})} \le C\|u\|_{L^r(B_3)}.$$

It follows from (18) and standard Riesz potential theory that

$$\|I\|_{C^{2\sigma+\beta}(B_1)} \le C\|\eta V u\|_{C^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\|u\|_{L^r(B_3)}$$

for some $\beta > 0$. Then the theorem follows from bootstrap arguments. □

2.2 Blow up profiles of solutions of nonlinear integral equations

Let $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of nonnegative constants satisfying $\lim_{i\to\infty} \tau_i = 0$, and set

$$p_i = (n+2\sigma)/(n-2\sigma) - \tau_i.$$

Suppose that $0 \le u_i \in L^{\infty}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies the nonlinear integral equation

$$u_i(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{21}$$

where Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and K_i are nonnegative bounded functions in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We assume that $K_i \in C^1(\Omega)$ and, for some positive constants A_1 and A_2,

$$\begin{aligned} 1/A_1 \le K_i(x) &\le A_1 \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, \\ \|K_i\|_{C^1(\Omega)} &\le A_2, \\ \|K_i\|_{C^{1,1}(\Omega)} &\le A_2, \quad \text{if } \sigma \le \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

It follows from Theorem 2.7 that for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and smooth $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} u_i &\in C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(\Omega'), \quad \text{if } \sigma > \frac{1}{2}; \\ u_i &\in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega'), \quad \text{if } \sigma = \frac{1}{2}; \\ u_i &\in C^{2+2\sigma}(\Omega'), \quad \text{if } \sigma < \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

We say that $\{u_i\}$ blows up if $\|u_i\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$.

Definition 2.8. *Suppose that $\{K_i\}$ satisfies* (22) *and $\{u_i\}$ satisfies* (21)*. We say a point $\overline{x} \in \Omega$ is an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ if there exist $0 < \overline{r} < dist(\overline{x}, \Omega)$, $\overline{C} > 0$, and a sequence x_i tending to $\overline{x}$, such that, x_i is a local maximum of u_i, $u_i(x_i) \to \infty$ and*

$$u_i(x) \le \overline{C}|x - x_i|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \quad \textit{for all } x \in B_{\overline{r}}(x_i).$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $B_3 \subset \Omega$.

Let $x_i \to \overline{x}$ be an isolated blow up of u_i. Define

$$\overline{u}_i(r) = \frac{1}{|\partial B_r|} \int_{\partial B_r(x_i)} u_i, \quad r > 0, \tag{24}$$

and

$$\overline{w}_j(r) = r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \overline{u}_i(r), \quad r > 0.$$

Definition 2.9. *We say $x_i \to \overline{x} \in \Omega$ is an isolated simple blow up point, if $x_i \to \overline{x}$ is an isolated blow up point, such that, for some $\rho > 0$ (independent of i) $\overline{w}_i$ has precisely one critical point in $(0, \rho)$ for large i.*

If $x_i \to 0$ is an isolated blow up point, then we will have the following Harnack inequality in the annulus centered at 0.

Lemma 2.10. *Suppose that $0 \le u_i \in L^\infty_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies* (21) *with K_i satisfying* (22)*. Suppose that $x_i \to 0$ is an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$, i.e., for some positive constants A_3 and $\bar{r}$ independent of i,*

$$|x - x_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(x) \le A_3 \quad \textit{for all } x \in B_{\bar{r}} \subset \Omega. \tag{25}$$

Then for any $0 < r < \frac{1}{3}\overline{r}$, we have the following Harnack inequality

$$\sup_{B_{2r}(x_i) \setminus \overline{B_{r/2}(x_i)}} u_i \le C \inf_{B_{2r}(x_i) \setminus \overline{B_{r/2}(x_i)}} u_i,$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on $n, \sigma, A_3, \bar{r}$ and $\sup_i \|K_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{\overline{r}}(x_i))}$.

Proof. For $0 < r < \frac{\bar{r}}{3}$, set

$$w_i(x) = r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(x_i + rx) \quad \text{for } x \in B_3.$$

We see that

$$w_i(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(x_i + ry) w_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y \quad x \in B_3.$$

Since $x_i \to 0$ is an isolated blow up point of u_i,

$$w_i(x) \le A_3 |x|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_3.$$

Set $V_i(y) = K_i(x_i + ry) w_i(y)^{p_i - 1}$. Clearly, $\|V_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{5/2} \setminus B_{1/4})} \le A_3 4^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}$. Covering $B_{5/2} \setminus B_{1/4}$ by finite many balls, then Lemma 2.10 follows immediately from the Harnack inequality in Theorem 2.6. □

The next proposition shows that if $x_i \to 0$ is an isolated blow up point, then the blow up profile has to be a standard bubble.

Proposition 2.11. *Assume the assumptions in Lemma 2.10. Then for any $R_i \to \infty$, $\varepsilon_i \to 0^+$, we have, after passing to a subsequence (still denoted as $\{u_i\}$, $\{x_i\}$, etc. ...), that*

$$\|m_i^{-1} u_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} \cdot + x_i) - (1 + k_i |\cdot|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2}\|_{C^2(B_{2R_i}(0))} \le \varepsilon_i,$$

$$r_i := R_i m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} \to 0 \quad \textit{as} \quad i \to \infty,$$

where $m_i = u_i(x_i)$ and $k_i = \left(\frac{K_i(x_i) \pi^{n/2} \Gamma(\sigma)}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2} + \sigma)} \right)^{1/\sigma}$.

Proof. Let

$$\varphi_i(x) = m_i^{-1} u_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} x + x_i) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It is easy to see that for $|x| < \overline{r} m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}$ we have

$$\varphi_i(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(m^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} y + x_i) \varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y, \tag{26}$$

$$\varphi_i(0) = 1, \quad \nabla \varphi_i(0) = 0, \quad 0 < \varphi_i(x) \le A_3 |x|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)}. \tag{27}$$

For any $R > 0$, we claim that

$$\|\varphi_i\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(B_R)} \le C(R) \tag{28}$$

for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and all sufficiently large i. Indeed, by (27) and Theorem 2.7, it suffices to prove that $\varphi_i \le C$ in B_1. If $\varphi_i(\bar{x}_i) = \sup_{B_1} \varphi_i \to \infty$, set

$$\tilde{\varphi}_i(z) = \varphi_i(\bar{x}_i)^{-1} \varphi_i(\varphi_i(\bar{x}_i)^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} z + \bar{x}_i) \le 1 \quad \text{for } |z| \le \frac{1}{2} \varphi_i(\bar{x}_i)^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}.$$

By (27),

$$\tilde{\varphi}_i(z_i) = \varphi_i(\bar{x}_i)^{-1}\varphi_i(0) \to 0$$

for $z_i = -\varphi_i(\bar{x}_i)^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}\bar{x}_i$. Since $\varphi_i(\bar{x}_i) \le A_3|\bar{x}_i|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)}$, we have $|z_i| \le A_3^{2\sigma/(p_1-1)}$. Hence, we can find $t > 0$ independent of i such that such that $z_i \in B_t$. Applying Theorem 2.6 to $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ in B_{2t} (since $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ satisfies a similar equation to (26)), we have

$$1 = \tilde{\varphi}_i(0) \le C\tilde{\varphi}_i(z_i) \to 0,$$

which is impossible. Thus (28) is valid.

It follows from (28) that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, $\varphi_i \to \varphi$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We write (26) as

$$\varphi_i(x) = \int_{B_R} \frac{K_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}y + x_i)\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h_i(R,x),$$

where

$$h_i(R,x) := \int_{B_R^c} \frac{K_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}y + x_i)\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Since K_i and φ_i are nonnegative, by (28) we have $\|h_i(R,\cdot)\|_{C^1(B_{R-1})} \le C(R)$ for all i large. Thus, after passing to a subsequence, $h_i(R,x) \to h(R,x)$ in $C^{1/2}(B_{R-1})$. Therefore,

$$h(R,x) = \varphi(x) - \int_{B_R} \frac{K_0\varphi(y)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \tag{29}$$

for $x \in B_{R-1}$, where $K_0 = \lim_{i\to\infty} K_i(x_i)$. Moreover, $h(R,x) \ge 0$, and is non-increasing in R. Note that for $R >> |x|$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{R^{n-2\sigma}}{(R+|x|)^{n-2\sigma}}h_i(R,0) &\le h_i(R,x)\\ &= \int_{B_R^c} \frac{K_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}y + x_i)\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|y|^{n-2\sigma}}\frac{|y|^{n-2\sigma}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y\\ &\le \frac{R^{n-2\sigma}}{(R-|x|)^{n-2\sigma}}h_i(R,0).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} h(R,x) = \lim_{R\to\infty} h(R,0). \tag{30}$$

Sending R to ∞ in (29), it follows from Lebesgue's monotone convergence theorem that

$$\varphi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_0\varphi(y)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\mathrm{d}y + c_0 \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $c_0 = \lim_{R\to\infty} h(R,0) \geq 0$. We claim that $c_0 = 0$. If not,

$$\varphi(x) - c_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_0 \varphi(y)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|y|^{n-2\sigma}}\, \mathrm{d}y > 0,$$

which implies that

$$1 = \varphi(0) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_0 c_0^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} = \infty.$$

This is impossible. It follows the classification theorem in [37] or [84] that

$$\varphi(x) = \left(1 + \lim_{i\to\infty} k_i |x|^2\right)^{-\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}$$

with $k_i = \left(\frac{K_i(x_i)\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(\sigma)}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\sigma)}\right)^{1/\sigma}$, where we used that $\varphi(0) = 1$ and $\nabla\varphi(0) = 0$. □

Note that since passing to subsequences does not affect our proofs, in the rest of the paper we will always choose $R_i \to \infty$ first, and then $\varepsilon_i \to 0^+$ as small as we wish (depending on R_i) and then choose our subsequence $\{u_i\}$ to work with.

Remark 2.12. *For $\sigma \geq 1$, we can have a simpler proof of local boundedness of φ_i. Indeed, Since*

$$\Delta_x \frac{1}{|x-z|^{n-2\sigma}} = \frac{2(n-2\sigma)(1-\sigma)}{|x-z|^{n-2\sigma+2}} \quad \text{if } x \neq z,$$

$\Delta w_i \leq 0$ if $\sigma \geq 1$. By maximum principle, we have $\min_{\partial B_R} \varphi_i \leq \varphi_i(0) = 1$ for any fixed $R > 0$. Then the local boundedness of φ_i follows from Lemma 2.10.

Consequently, we have the following lower bound of u_i near isolated blow up points. To save the notation, we may assume that $\bar{r} = 2$.

Proposition 2.13. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition 2.11, there exists some positive constant $C = C(n, \sigma, A_1, A_2, A_3)$ such that,*

$$u_i(x) \geq C^{-1} m_i (1 + k_i m_i^{(p_i-1)/\sigma} |x - x_i|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2} \quad \text{for all } |x - x_i| \leq 1.$$

In particular, for any $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|e| = 1$, we have

$$u_i(x_i + e) \geq C^{-1} m_i^{-1+((n-2\sigma)/2\sigma)\tau_i},$$

where $\tau_i = (n+2\sigma)/(n-2\sigma) - p_i$.

Proof. By change of variables and using Proposition 2.11, we have for $r_i \le |x - x_i| \le 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &\ge C \int_{|y-x_i|\le r_i} \frac{u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\ge Cm_i \int_{|z|\le R_i} \frac{\left(m_i^{-1}u_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}z + x_i)\right)^{p_i}}{|m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(x-x_i) - z|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}z \\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}Cm_i \int_{|z|\le R_i} \frac{U_i(z)^{p_i}}{|m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(x-x_i) - z|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}z \\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}Cm_i \int_{|z|\le R_i} \frac{U_i(z)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(x-x_i) - z|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}z \\ &\ge \frac{1}{4}Cm_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{U_i(z)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(x-x_i) - z|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \frac{1}{4}Cm_iU_i(m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(x-x_i)), \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where

$$U_i(z) = \left(\frac{1}{1+k_i|z|^2}\right)^{(n-2\sigma)/2}.$$

The proposition follows immediately from the above and Proposition 2.11. □

To obtain the desired upper bound of u_i near isolated simple blow up points, we need an auxiliary bound in the below, and a Pohozaev type identity in Proposition 2.15. Pohozaev type identities for fractional Laplacian and some applications can be found in [95, 96].

Lemma 2.14. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition 2.11 with $\bar{r} = 2$, and in addition that $x_i \to 0$ is also an isolated simple blow up point with the constant ρ, then there exists $\delta_i > 0$, $\delta_i = O(R_i^{-2\sigma+o(1)})$, such that*

$$u_i(x) \le C_1 R_i^{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i} u_i(x_i)^{-\lambda_i} |x - x_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i} \quad \text{for all } r_i \le |x - x_i| \le 1,$$

where $\lambda_i = (n - 2\sigma - \delta_i)(p_i - 1)/2\sigma - 1$ and C_1 is some positive constant depending only on n, σ, A_1, A_3 and ρ.

Proof. We divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. From Proposition 2.11, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(x) &\le Cm_i \left(\frac{1}{1+|m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(x-x_i)|^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} \\ &\le Cu_i(x_i)R_i^{2\sigma-n} \quad \text{for all } |x-x_i| = r_i = R_i m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Let $\overline{u}_i(r)$ be the average of u_i over the sphere of radius r centered at x_i. It follows from the assumption of isolated simple blow up points and Proposition 2.11 that

$$r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(r) \quad \text{is strictly decreasing for } r_i < r < \rho. \tag{33}$$

By Lemma 2.10, (33) and (32), we have, for all $r_i < |x - x_i| < \rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} |x-x_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}u_i(x) &\le C|x-x_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(|x-x_i|) \\ &\le Cr_i^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(r_i) \\ &\le CR_i^{\frac{2\sigma-n}{2}+o(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $o(1)$ denotes some quantity tending to 0 as $i \to \infty$. Thus,

$$u_i(x)^{p_i-1} \le CR_i^{-2\sigma+o(1)}|x-x_i|^{-2\sigma} \quad \text{for all } r_i \le |x-x_i| \le \rho. \tag{34}$$

Step 2. Let

$$\mathcal{L}_i\phi(y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(z)u_i(z)^{p_i-1}\phi(z)}{|y-z|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}z.$$

Thus

$$u_i = \mathcal{L}_i u_i.$$

Note that for $2\sigma < \mu < n$ and $0 < |x| < 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}|y|^{\mu}}\,\mathrm{d}y &= |x|^{2\sigma-n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{||x|^{-1}x-|x|^{-1}y|^{n-2\sigma}|y|^{\mu}}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &= |x|^{-\mu+2\sigma}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{||x|^{-1}x-z|^{n-2\sigma}|z|^{\mu}}\,\mathrm{d}z \\ &\le C\Big(\frac{1}{n-\mu}+\frac{1}{\mu-2\sigma}+1\Big)|x|^{-\mu+2\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

where we did the change of variables $y = |x|z$. By (34), one can properly choose $0 < \delta_i = O(R_i^{-2\sigma+o(1)})$ such that

$$\int_{r_i<|y-x_i|<\rho} \frac{K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i-1}|y-x_i|^{-\delta_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \le \frac{1}{4}|x-x_i|^{-\delta_i}, \tag{35}$$

and

$$\int_{r_i<|y-x_i|<\rho} \frac{K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i-1}|y-x_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \le \frac{1}{4}|x-x_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i}, \tag{36}$$

for all $r_i < |x - x_i| < \rho$.

Set $M_i := 4 \cdot 2^{n-2\sigma} \max_{\partial B_\rho(x_i)} u_i$,

$$f_i(x) := M_i \rho^{\delta_i} |x - x_i|^{-\delta_i} + A R_i^{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i} m_i^{-\lambda_i} |x - x_i|^{2\sigma - n + \delta_i},$$

and

$$\phi_i(x) = \begin{cases} f_i(x), & r_i < |x - x_i| < \rho, \\ u_i(x), & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

where $A > 1$ will be chosen later.

By (35) and (36), we have for $r_i < |x - x_i| < \rho$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_i \phi_i(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i - 1} \phi_i(y)}{|x - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \int_{|y - x_i| \le r_i} + \int_{r_i < |y - x_i| < \rho} + \int_{\rho \le |y - x_i|} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i - 1} \phi_i(y)}{|x - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &\le A_1 \int_{|y - x_i| \le r_i} \frac{u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y + \frac{f_i}{4} + \int_{\rho \le |y - x_i|} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i - 1} \phi_i(y)}{|x - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the third term, we let $\bar{x} = \rho \frac{x - x_i}{|x - x_i|} \in \partial B_\rho(x_i)$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\rho \le |y - x_i|} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i - 1} \phi_i(y)}{|x - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \int_{\rho \le |y - x_i|} \frac{|\bar{x} - y|^{n-2\sigma}}{|x - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i - 1} \phi_i(y)}{|\bar{x} - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &\le 2^{n-2\sigma} \int_{\rho \le |y - x_i|} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i - 1} \phi_i(y)}{|\bar{x} - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &\le 2^{n-2\sigma} u_i(\bar{x}) \le 2^{n-2\sigma} \max_{\partial B_\rho(x_i)} u_i \le M_i / 4. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

To estimate the first term, we use change of variables, Proposition 2.11 and the computations in (31) that,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|y - x_i| \le r_i} \frac{u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y &= m_i \int_{|z| \le R_i} \frac{\left(m_i^{-1} u_i(m_i^{-(p_i - 1)/2\sigma} z + x_i)\right)^{p_i}}{|m_i^{(p_i - 1)/2\sigma}(x - x_i) - z|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}z \\ &\le 2 m_i \int_{|z| \le R_i} \frac{U_i(z)^{p_i}}{|m_i^{(p_i - 1)/2\sigma}(x - x_i) - z|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}z \\ &\le C m_i R_i^{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{U_i(z)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|m_i^{(p_i - 1)/2\sigma}(x - x_i) - z|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}z \\ &= C m_i R_i^{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i} U_i(m_i^{(p_i - 1)/2\sigma}(x - x_i)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$U_i(z) = \left(\frac{1}{1+k_i|z|^2}\right)^{(n-2\sigma)/2}.$$

Since $|x - x_i| > r_i$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} m_i U_i(m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(x-x_i)) &\le C m_i^{1-(p_i-1)(n-2\sigma)/2\sigma}|x-x_i|^{2\sigma-n} \\ &\le C m_i^{-\lambda_i}|x-x_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{L}_i\phi_i(x) \le \phi_i(x) \quad \text{for all } r_i \le |x-x_i| \le \rho, \tag{38}$$

provided that A is sufficiently large and independent of i.

Step 3. In view of (32), we may choose A large such that $f_i \ge u_i$ on $\partial B_{r_i}(x_i)$. By the choice of M_i, we know that $f_i \ge u_i$ on $\partial B_\rho(x_i)$. We claim that

$$u_i \le \phi_i \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Indeed, if not, let

$$1 < t_i := \inf\{t > 1 : t\phi_i \ge u_i \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n\} < \infty.$$

Since $t_i\phi_i \ge u_i$ in $B_{r_i}(x_i) \cup B_\rho^c(x_i)$, by the continuity there exists $y_i \in B_\rho(x_i) \setminus \bar{B}_{r_i}(x_i)$ such that

$$0 = t_i\phi_i(y_i) - u_i(y_i) \ge \mathcal{L}_i(t_i\phi_i - u_i)(y_i) > 0.$$

This is a contradiction. Therefore, the claim is proved.

Step 4. For $r_i < \theta < \rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} M_i &\le C\rho^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(\rho) \\ &\le C\theta^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(\theta) \\ &\le C\theta^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\{M_i\rho^{\delta_i}\theta^{-\delta_i} + AR_i^{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i} m_i^{-\lambda_i}\theta^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $\theta = \theta(n, \sigma, \rho, A_1, A_2, A_3)$ sufficiently small so that

$$C\theta^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\rho^{\delta_i}\theta^{-\delta_i} \le \frac{1}{2}\rho^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}.$$

It follows that

$$M_i \le C R_i^{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i} m_i^{-\lambda_i}.$$

The lemma follows from the above and the Harnack inequality in Lemma 2.10. □

Proposition 2.15 (Pohozaev type identity)**.** *Let $u \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $u \in C(\overline{B}_R)$ be a solution of*

$$u(x) = \int_{B_R} \frac{K(y)u(y)^p}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \,\mathrm{d}y + h_R(x),$$

where $1 < p \leq \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$, and $h_R(x) \in C^1(B_R)$, $\nabla h_R \in L^1(B_R)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{n-2\sigma}{2} - \frac{n}{p+1}\right) \int_{B_R} K(x)u(x)^{p+1} \,\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{p+1} \int_{B_R} x\nabla K(x)u(x)^{p+1} \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \frac{n-2\sigma}{2} \int_{B_R} K(x)u(x)^p h_R(x) \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{B_R} x\nabla h_R(x) K(x)u(x)^p \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad - \frac{R}{p+1} \int_{\partial B_R} K(x)u(x)^{p+1} \,\mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first prove the case $\sigma > 1/2$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{p+1} \int_{B_R} xK(x)\nabla u(x)^{p+1} \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_{B_R} xK(x)u(x)^p \nabla u(x) \\
&= (2\sigma - n) \int_{B_R} xK(x)u(x)^p \int_{B_R} \frac{(x-y)K(y)u(y)^p}{|x-y|^{n+2-2\sigma}} \,\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{B_R} xK(x)u(x)^p \nabla h_R(x) \,\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned}$$

By the divergence theorem,

$$\int_{B_R} xK(x)\nabla u(x)^{p+1} \,\mathrm{d}x = -\int_{B_R} (nK(x) + x\nabla K(x))u(x)^{p+1} \,\mathrm{d}x + R\int_{\partial B_R} K(x)u(x)^{p+1} \,\mathrm{d}s.$$

By direct computations,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_R} xK(x)u(x)^p \int_{B_R} \frac{(x-y)K(y)u(y)^p}{|x-y|^{n+2-2\sigma}} \,\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_R} K(x)u(x)^p \int_{B_R} \frac{(|x-y|^2 + (|x|^2 - |y|^2))K(y)u(y)^p}{|x-y|^{n+2-2\sigma}} \,\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_R} K(x)u(x)^p \int_{B_R} \frac{K(y)u(y)^p}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \,\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_R} K(x)u(x)^p (u(x) - h_R(x)) \,\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the proposition follows immediately for $\sigma > 1/2$.

When $0 < \sigma \le 1/2$, we can truncate the kernel $\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}$ by

$$G_\varepsilon(x,y) = \begin{cases} \frac{2\sigma-n}{2}\varepsilon^{-n+2\sigma-2}|x-y|^2 + \frac{n-2\sigma+2}{2}\varepsilon^{-n+2\sigma}, & \text{if } |x-y| \le \varepsilon \\ |x-y|^{-n+2\sigma}, & \text{if } |x-y| > \varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

so that $G_\varepsilon \in C^1$, where $0 < \varepsilon < R/2$ is small, and define

$$v_\varepsilon = \int_{B_R} G_\varepsilon(x,y)K(y)u(y)^p \,\mathrm{d}y + h_R(x).$$

Then the identity follows from an approximation argument by doing the same computations as above for v_ε and sending $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the end. □

Lemma 2.16. *Under the assumptions in Lemma 2.14, we have*

$$\tau_i = O(u_i(x_i)^{-c_1+o(1)}),$$

where $c_1 = \min\{2, 2/(n-2\sigma)\}$. *Thus*

$$u_i(x_i)^{\tau_i} = 1 + o(1).$$

Proof. Applying Theorem 2.6, Theorem 2.7 and Proposition 2.14 to u_i, we have

$$\|u_i\|_{C^2(B_{3/2}(x_i)\setminus B_{1/2}(x_i))} \le C R_i^{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i} m_i^{-\lambda_i}. \tag{39}$$

Choose $R_i \le m_i^{o(1)}$. We write the equation (21) of u_i as

$$u_i(x) = \int_{B_1(x_i)} \frac{K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \,\mathrm{d}y + h_i(x), \tag{40}$$

where

$$h_i(x) := \int_{|y-x_i|\ge 1} \frac{K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Since K_i and u_i are nonnegative, by (39) and the computation in (37), we have for any $x \in B_1(x_i)$

$$h_i(x) \le 2^{n-2\sigma} \max_{\partial B_1(x_i)} u_i \le C m_i^{-1+o(1)} \tag{41}$$

and

$$|\nabla h_i(x)| \le \begin{cases} C\frac{|1-(1-|x-x_i|)^{2\sigma-1}|}{|2\sigma-1|} m_i^{-1+o(1)} & \text{if } \sigma \ne 1/2 \\ C|\log(1-|x-x_i|)| m_i^{-1+o(1)} & \text{if } \sigma = 1/2. \end{cases} \tag{42}$$

Indeed, when $|x-x_i|<7/8$, it is easy to see that

$$|\nabla h_i(x)| \le C\int_{|y-x_i|\ge 1}\frac{K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma+1}}\,\mathrm{d}y \le C\max_{\partial B_1(x_i)} u_i \le Cm_i^{-1+o(1)}.$$

When $7/8\le|x-x_i|\le 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla h_i(x)| &\le C\int_{|y-x_i|\ge 1,\ |y-x|\ge 1/8} + \int_{|y-x_i|\ge 1,\ |y-x|<1/8}\frac{K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma+1}}\,\mathrm{d}y\\ &\le C\max_{\partial B_1(x_i)} u_i + Cm_i^{-p_i+o(1)}\int_{1-|x|<|y-x|<1/8}\frac{\mathrm{d}y}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma+1}}\\ &\le \begin{cases} C\frac{|1-(1-|x-x_i|)^{2\sigma-1}|}{|2\sigma-1|}m_i^{-1+o(1)} & \text{if } \sigma\ne 1/2\\ C|\log(1-|x-x_i|)|m_i^{-1+o(1)} & \text{if } \sigma=1/2.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 2.15 to (40) yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\tau_i\int_{B_1(x_i)} u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\le C\Big(\int_{B_1(x_i)}|x-x_i|u_i(x)^{p_i+1} + (h_i(x)+|\nabla h_i(x)|)u_i(x)^{p_i} + \int_{\partial B_1(x_i)} u_i^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}s\Big).\end{aligned}\tag{43}$$

By Proposition 2.11 and change of variables,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_1(x_i)} u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x &\ge C^{-1}\int_{B_{r_i}(x_i)}\frac{m_i^{p_i+1}}{(1+|m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(y-x_i)|^2)^{(n-2\sigma)(p_i+1)/2}}\,\mathrm{d}y\\ &\ge C^{-1}m_i^{\tau_i(n/2\sigma-1)}\int_{R_i}\frac{1}{(1+|z|^2)^{(n-2\sigma)(p_i+1)/2}}\,\mathrm{d}z\\ &\ge C^{-1}m_i^{\tau_i(n/2\sigma-1)},\end{aligned}\tag{44}$$

$$\int_{B_{r_i}(x_i)} u_i(x)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}x \le Cm_i^{-1+o(1)}$$

and

$$\int_{B_{r_i}(x_i)}|x-x_i|u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x \le Cm_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)+o(1)}.$$

By Lemma 2.14, (41) and (42)

$$\int_{r_i<|x-x_i|<1}(h_i(x)+|\nabla h_i(x)|)u_i(x)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}x \le Cm_i^{-2+o(1)},$$

$$\int_{r_i<|x-x_i|<1}|x-x_i|u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x \le Cm_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)+o(1)},$$

and

$$\int_{\partial B_1(x_i)} u_i^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}s \le C m_i^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)+o(1)}.$$

The lemma follows from the above estimates immediately. Consequently, if we choose $R_i \le m_i^{o(1)}$ as in the beginning of the proof, then we have that

$$R_i^{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i} = 1 + o(1),$$

which will be used later. □

Now we are ready to obtain our desired upper bound of u_i near isolated simple blow up points.

Proposition 2.17. *Under the assumptions in Lemma 2.14, we have*

$$u_i(x) \le C u_i^{-1}(x_i)|x - x_i|^{2\sigma-n} \quad \textit{for all } |x - x_i| \le 1.$$

Proof. For $|x-x_i| \le r_i$, the proposition follows immediately from Proposition 2.11 and Lemma 2.16.

We shall show first that

$$u_i(\rho e + x_i)u_i(x_i) \le C \tag{45}$$

for any vector $|e| = 1$. We assume the contrary that (45) does not hold. Then along a subsequence we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(\rho e + x_i)u_i(x_i) = +\infty.$$

Since $u_i(x) \le A_3|x - x_i|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)}$ in $B_2(x_i)$, it follows from Lemma 2.10 that for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ there exists a positive constant $C(\varepsilon)$, depending on n, σ, A_1, A_2, A_3 and ε, such that

$$\sup_{B_{5/2}(x_i)\setminus B_\varepsilon(x_i)} u_i \le C(\varepsilon) \inf_{B_{5/2}(x_i)\setminus B_\varepsilon(x_i)} u_i. \tag{46}$$

Let $\varphi_i(x) = u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{-1}u_i(x)$. Then for $|x - x_i| \le 1$,

$$\varphi_i(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(y)u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{p_i-1}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x - y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Since $\varphi_i(\rho e + x_i) = 1$, by (46)

$$\|\varphi_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/2}(x_i)\setminus B_\varepsilon(x_i))} \le C(\varepsilon) \quad \text{for } 0 < \varepsilon < 1. \tag{47}$$

Besides, by Lemma 2.14,

$$u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{p_i-1} \to 0 \quad \text{as } i \to \infty. \tag{48}$$

Applying the local estimates in Section 2.1 to φ_i, we conclude that there exists $\varphi \in C^2(B_1\setminus\{0\})$ such that, after passing to a subsequence, $\varphi_i \to \varphi$ in $C^2_{loc}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$.

Let us write the equation of φ_i as

$$\varphi_i(x) = \int_{B_1(x_i)} \frac{K_i(y)u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{p_i-1}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h_i(x). \tag{49}$$

By (47), Theorem 2.7 and the proof of (42), there exists $h \in C^2(B_1)$ such that, after passing to a subsequence,

$$h_i(x) \to h(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(B_1). \tag{50}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{B_1(x_i)} \frac{K_i(y)u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{p_i-1}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y = \varphi_i(x) - h_i(x) \to \varphi(x) - h(x) \quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(B_1\setminus\{0\}).$$

We shall evaluate what $G(x) := \varphi(x) - h(x)$ is. For any $|x| > 0$ and $2|x_i| \leq \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}|x - x_i|$, in view of (47) and (48) we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(x) &= \lim_{i\to\infty} \int_{B_\varepsilon(x_i)} \frac{K_i(y)u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{p_i-1}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &= |x|^{2\sigma-n}(1+O(\varepsilon)) \lim_{i\to\infty} \int_{B_\varepsilon(x_i)} K_i(y)u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{p_i-1}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &= |x|^{2\sigma-n}(1+O(\varepsilon))a(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

for some nonnegative function $a(\varepsilon)$ of ε. Clearly, $a(\varepsilon)$ is nondecreasing, so $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} a(\varepsilon)$ exists which we denote as a. Sending $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain

$$G(x) = a|x|^{2\sigma-n}.$$

Since $x_i \to 0$ is an isolated simple blow point, we have $r^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}\bar\varphi(r) \geq \rho^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}\bar\varphi(\rho)$ for $0 < r < \rho$. It follows that φ is singular at 0, and thus, $a > 0$. Hence,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \int_{B_{1/8}(x_i)} K_i(y)u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{p_i-1}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}y > C\cdot G(e/2) > 0.$$

However,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{1/8}(x_i)} K_i(y)u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{p_i-1}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq C u_i(\rho e + x_i)^{-1} \int_{B_{1/8}(x_i)} u_i(y)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq \frac{C}{u_i(\rho e + x_i)u_i(x_i)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } i \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Proposition 2.11, Lemma 2.14 and Lemma 2.16 in the second inequality. This is a contradiction.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\rho \le 1/2$. It follows from Lemma 2.10 and (45) that Proposition 2.17 holds for $\rho \le |x - x_i| \le 1$. To establish the inequality in the proposition for $r_i \le |x - x_i| \le \rho$, we only need to scale the problem and reduce it to the case of $|x-x_i| = 1$. Suppose the contrary that there exists a subsequence $\tilde{x}_i$ satisfying $r_i \le |\tilde{x}_i - x_i| \le \rho$ and $\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(\tilde{x}_i)u_i(x_i)|\tilde{x}_i - x_i|^{n-2\sigma} = +\infty$.

Set $\tilde{r}_i := |\tilde{x}_i - x_i|$, $\tilde{u}_i(x) = \tilde{r}_i^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}u_i(x_i + \tilde{r}_i x)$. Then $\{u_i\}$ satisfies

$$\tilde{u}_i(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(x_i + \tilde{r}_i y)\tilde{u}_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \quad \text{for } x \in B_2,$$

and all the hypotheses of Proposition 2.17 with 0 being an isolated simple blow up point. It follows from (45) that

$$\tilde{u}_i(0)\tilde{u}_i(\frac{\tilde{x}_i - x_i}{\tilde{r}_i}) \le C.$$

It follows (using Lemma 2.16) that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(\tilde{x}_i)u_i(x_i)|\tilde{x}_i - x_i|^{n-2\sigma} < \infty.$$

This is again a contradiction.

Therefore, the proposition is proved. □

Corollary 2.18. *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 2.14, we have*

$$\int_{|x-x_i|\le r_i} |x-x_i|^s u_i(x)^{p_i+1} = \begin{cases} O(u_i(x_i)^{-2s/(n-2\sigma)}), & -n < s < n, \\ O(u_i(x_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}\log u_i(x_i)), & s = n, \\ o(u_i(x_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}), & s > n, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\int_{r_i<|x-x_i|\le 1} |x-x_i|^s u_i(x)^{p_i+1} = \begin{cases} o(u_i(x_i)^{-2s/(n-2\sigma)}), & -n < s < n, \\ O(u_i(x_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}\log u_i(x_i)), & s = n, \\ O(u_i(x_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}), & s > n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Making use of Proposition 2.11, Lemma 2.16 and Proposition 2.17, the corollary follows immediately. □

By Proposition 2.17 and its proof, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.19. *Under the assumptions in Lemma 2.14, if we let $T_i(x) = T_i'(x) + T_i''(x)$, where*

$$T_i'(x) := u_i(x_i) \int_{B_1(x_i)} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y$$

and

$$T_i''(x) := u_i(x_i) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(x_i)} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y.$$

Then, after passing a subsequence,

$$T_i'(x) \to a|x|^{2\sigma-n} \quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$$

and

$$T_i''(x) \to h(x) \quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(B_1)$$

for some $h(x) \in C^2(B_2)$, where

$$a = \Big(\frac{\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(\sigma)}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\sigma)} \Big)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{1+|y|^2} \right)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{2}} \mathrm{d}y \lim_{i\to\infty} K_i(0)^{\frac{2\sigma-n}{2\sigma}}. \tag{51}$$

Consequently, we have

$$u_i(x_i) u_i(x) \to a|x|^{2\sigma-n} + h(x) \quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(B_1 \setminus \{0\}).$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 2.17, we set $\varphi_i(x) = u_i(x_i)u_i(x)$, which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_i(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(x_i)^{1-p_i} \varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|y-x|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &=: \int_{B_1(x_i)} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(x_i)^{1-p_i} \varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|y-x|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y + h_i(x) = T_i'(x) + T_i''(x). \end{aligned}$$

We have all the ingredients as in the proof of Proposition 2.17. Hence, we only need to evaluate the positive constant a. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, by Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a \int_{B_{1/2}\setminus B_{1/4}} |x|^{2\sigma-n} \, \mathrm{d}x &= \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x_i) \int_{B_{1/2}\setminus B_{1/4}} \left(\int_{B_\varepsilon(x_i)} \frac{K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|y-x|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x_i) \int_{B_\varepsilon(x_i)} K_i(y) u_i(y)^{p_i} \left(\int_{B_{1/2}\setminus B_{1/4}} \frac{1}{|y-x|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}x \right) \mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

After sending $\varepsilon \to 0$, we have

$$a \int_{B_{1/2}\setminus B_{1/4}} |x|^{2\sigma-n}\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{B_{1/2}\setminus B_{1/4}} |x|^{2\sigma-n}\,\mathrm{d}x \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x_i) \int_{B_\varepsilon(x_i)} K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Thus, by Proposition 2.11 and Lemma 2.16, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x_i) \int_{B_{r_i}(x_i)} K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &= \lim_{i\to\infty} K_i(0)k_i^{-\frac{n}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{1+|y|^2}\right)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{2}} \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \Big(\frac{\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(\sigma)}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\sigma)}\Big)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{1+|y|^2}\right)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{2}} \mathrm{d}y \lim_{i\to\infty} K_i(0)^{\frac{2\sigma-n}{2\sigma}}, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \int_{B_\varepsilon\setminus B_{r_i}(x_i)} u_i(x_i)K_i(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}y = 0.$$

□

2.3 Fine analysis of blow up with a flatness condition

For later applications, we consider nonnegative solutions of

$$u_i(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(y)H_i(y)^{\tau_i}(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \quad \text{for } x \in B_3 \tag{52}$$

where K_i satisfies (22) with $\Omega = B_3$ as before, and $\{H_i\} \in C^{1,1}(B_3)$ satisfies

$$A_4^{-1} \le H_i(x) \le A_4 \quad \text{for } y \in B_3, \quad \|H_i\|_{C^{1,1}(B_3)} \le A_5 \tag{53}$$

for some positive constants A_4, A_5. We assume that $x_i \to 0$ is an isolated simple blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ with constant A_3 and ρ, i.e.,

$$|x-x_i|^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma} u_i(x) \le A_3,$$

and $r^{\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}\bar{u}_i(r)$ has precisely one critical point in $(0,\rho)$ for large i, where $\bar{u}_i(r) = \fint_{\partial B_r(x_i)} u_i\,\mathrm{d}s$.

Lemma 2.20. *Suppose that K_i satisfies the $(*)'_\beta$ condition in B_3 with $\beta < n$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i \le & Cu_i(x_i)^{-2} + C|\nabla K_i(x_i)|u_i(x_i)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)} \\ & + C(L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1})u_i(x_i)^{-2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, \beta$ and ρ.

Proof. Note that Proposition 2.11 and Proposition 2.17 hold for the u_i here. Let us write equation (52) as

$$u_i(x) = \int_{B_1(x_i)} \frac{K_i(y)H_i(y)^{\tau_i}(y)u_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y + h_i(x). \tag{54}$$

It follows from Proposition 2.17 and (42) that for $x \in B_1(x_i)$

$$|\nabla h_i(x)| \le \begin{cases} C\frac{|1-(1-|x-x_i|)^{2\sigma-1}|}{|2\sigma-1|}m_i^{-1} & \text{if } \sigma \neq 1/2 \\ C|\log(1-|x-x_i|)|m_i^{-1} & \text{if } \sigma = 1/2. \end{cases} \tag{55}$$

Using Proposition 2.15 and Lemma 2.16, by the same proof of Lemma 2.16 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i &\le Cu_i(x_i)^{-2} + C\left|\int_{B_1(x_i)} (x-x_i)\nabla(K_iH_i^{\tau_i})(x)u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\le Cu_i(x_i)^{-2} + C\tau_i\int_{B_1(x_i)} |x-x_i|u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + C\left|\int_{B_1(x_i)} (x-x_i)\nabla K_i(x)H_i^{\tau_i}u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

By Corollary 2.18, the second term of the right hand side is less than $\tau_i/2$ for i large. It suffices to evaluate the third term, for which we will use the flatness condition. We see

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\int_{B_1(x_i)} (x-x_i)\nabla K_iH_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}\right| \\ &\le C|\nabla K_i(x_i)|\int_{B_1(x_i)} |x-x_i|u_i^{p_i+1} \\ &\quad + C\int_{B_1(x_i)} |x-x_i||\nabla K_i(x)-\nabla K_i(x_i)|u_i^{p_i+1} \\ &\le C|\nabla K_i(x_i)|u_i(x_i)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)} \\ &\quad + C\int_{B_1(x_i)} |x-x_i||\nabla K_i(x)-\nabla K_i(x_i)|u_i^{p_i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of $(*)_\beta$, a direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} &|\nabla K_i(x)-\nabla K_i(x_i)| \\ &\le \Big\{\sum_{s=2}^{[\beta]} |\nabla^s K_i(x_i)||x-x_i|^{s-1} + [\nabla^{[\beta]}K_i]_{C^{\beta-[\beta]}(B_1(x_i))}|x-x_i|^{\beta-1}\Big\} \\ &\le CL(\beta,i)\Big\{\sum_{s=2}^{[\beta]} |\nabla K_i(x_i)|^{(\beta-s)/(\beta-1)}|x-x_i|^{s-1} + |x-x_i|^{\beta-1}\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &L(\beta,i)|\nabla K_i(x_i)|^{(\beta-s)/(\beta-1)}|x-x_i|^s \\ &\le C(|\nabla K_i(x_i)||x-x_i| + (L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1})|x-x_i|^\beta). \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Hence, by Corollary 2.18 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_1(x_i)} |x-x_i||\nabla K_i(x)-\nabla K_i(x_i)|u_i^{p_i+1} \\ &\le C|\nabla K_i(x_i)|u_i(x_i)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)} + C(L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1})u_i(x_i)^{-2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}. \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Lemma 2.20 follows immediately. □

Lemma 2.21. *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 2.20,*

$$|\nabla K_i(x_i)| \le Cu_i(x_i)^{-2} + C(L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1})u_i(x_i)^{-2(\beta-1)/(n-2\sigma)},$$

where $C>0$ depends only on $n,\sigma,A_1,A_2,A_3,A_4,A_5,\beta$ and ρ.

Proof. By (54) and integrating by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{\partial B_1} x_j K_i(x)H_i(x)^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}s - \frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{B_1}\partial_j(K_i(x)H_i(x)^{\tau_i})u_i^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{B_1} K_i(x)H_i(x)^{\tau_i}\partial_j u_i^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= (2\sigma-n)\int_{B_1} K_i(x)H_i(x)^{\tau_i}u_i(x)^{p_i}\int_{B_1}\frac{(x_j-y_j)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma+2}}K_i(y)H_i(y)^{\tau_i}u_i(y)^{p_i}\,\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \int_{B_1} K_i(x)H_i(x)^{\tau_i}u_i(x)^{p_i}\partial_j h_i(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_{B_1} K_i(x)H_i(x)^{\tau_i}u_i(x)^{p_i}\partial_j h_i(x)\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

(If $\sigma<1/2$, then one can similar approximation arguments in the proof of Proposition 2.15.) Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\int_{B_1}\nabla(K_i(x)H_i(x)^{\tau_i})u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\le C\Big(\int_{B_1} u_i^{p_i}|\nabla h_i| + \int_{\partial B_1} u_i^{p_i+1}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Proposition 2.17 and Theorem 2.7 that $u_i(x) \le C u_i(x_i)^{-1}$ for $1/2 \le |x| \le 1$, and (55) holds. Hence, by Corollary 2.18

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{B_1} \nabla K_i(x) H_i(x)^{\tau_i} u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\le C(u_i(x)^{-2} + \tau_i \int_{B_1} u_i^{p_i+1}) \\ &\le C(u_i(x_i)^{-2} + \tau_i). \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

As that in proof of Lemma 2.20, we write

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_1} \nabla K_i(x) H_i(x)^{\tau_i} u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \nabla K_i(x_i) \int_{B_1} H_i(x)^{\tau_i} u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{B_1} (\nabla K_i(x) - \nabla K_i(x_i)) H_i(x)^{\tau_i} u_i(x)^{p_i+1}\,\mathrm{d}x,\end{aligned}$$

then use the triangle inequality and the $(*)_\beta$ condition (as in (57)-(58)) to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla K_i(x_i)| \le & C u_i(x_i)^{-2} + C\tau_i + \frac{1}{4}|\nabla K_i(x_i)| \\ &+ C(L(\beta,i) + L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1}) u_i(x_i)^{-2(\beta-1)/(n-2\sigma)}.\end{aligned}$$

Together with Lemma 2.20, the Lemma follows immediately. □

Combining the above two lemmas, we immediately obtain:

Lemma 2.22. *We have*

$$\tau_i \le C u_i(x_i)^{-2} + C(L(\beta,i) + L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1}) u_i(x_i)^{-2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}.$$

Corollary 2.23. *We further assume that one of the following two conditions holds: (i)*

$$\beta = n - 2\sigma \text{ and } L(\beta,i) = o(1),$$

and (ii)

$$\beta > n - 2\sigma \text{ and } L(\beta,i) = O(1).$$

Then for any $0 < \delta < 1$ we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x_i)^2 \int_{B_\delta(x_i)} (x - x_i)\cdot \nabla(K_i H_i^{\tau_i}) u_i^{p_i+1} = 0.$$

Proof. By triangle inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{B_\delta(x_i)}(x-x_i)\cdot\nabla(K_iH_i^{\tau_i})u_i^{p_i+1}\right| \\
&\le \left|\int_{B_\delta(x_i)}(x-x_i)\cdot\nabla K_iH_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}\right| + \tau_i\left|\int_{B_\delta(x_i)}(x-x_i)\cdot\nabla H_iH^{\tau_i-1}K_iu_i^{p_i+1}\right| \\
&\le C|\nabla K_i(x_i)|\int_{B_\delta(x_i)}|x-x_i|u_i^{p_i+1} \\
&\quad + C\int_{B_\delta(x_i)}|x-x_i||\nabla K_i(x)-\nabla K_i(x_i)|u_i^{p_i+1} + C\tau_i\int_{B_\delta(x_i)}|x-x_i|u_i^{p_i+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the corollary follows from Lemma 2.21, (59), Lemma 2.22 and Corollary 2.18. □

2.4 Isolated blow up points have to be isolated simple

In this subsection, we will prove that under suitable assumptions on K_i, isolated blow up points have to be isolated simple.

Proposition 2.24. *Let $u_i \ge 0$ be a solution of* (52)*, where K_i satisfies* (22) *and $(*)'_{n-2\sigma}$ condition with $\Omega = B_3$, and H_i satisfies* (53)*. Suppose that $x_i \to 0$ is an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ in B_2 for some positive constant A_3, i.e.,*

$$|x-x_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}u_i(x) \le A_3 \quad \text{in } B_2.$$

then $x_i \to 0$ is an isolated simple blow up point.

Proof. Due to Proposition 2.11, $r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(r)$ has precisely one critical point in the interval $0 < r < r_i$, where $r_i = R_iu_i(x_i)^{-\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}$ as before. Suppose $x_i \to 0$ is not an isolated simple blow up point and let μ_i be the second critical point of $r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(r)$. Then we see that

$$\mu_i \ge r_i, \quad \lim_{i\to\infty}\mu_i = 0. \tag{61}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $x_i = 0$. Set

$$\varphi_i(x) = \mu_i^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}u_i(\mu_ix), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Clearly, φ_i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_i(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)^{\tau_i}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \quad \text{in } B_{3/\mu_i} \\
|x|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\varphi_i(x) &\le A_3 \quad \text{for } |x| < 2/\mu_i \to \infty, \\
\lim_{i\to\infty}\varphi_i(0) &= \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

$r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{\varphi}_i(r)$ has precisely one critical point in $0<r<1$,

and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\left\{r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{\varphi}_i(r)\right\}\Big|_{r=1}=0,$$

where $\tilde{K}_i(y)=K_i(\mu_i y)$, $\tilde{H}_i(y)=H_i(\mu_i y)$ and $\overline{\varphi}_i(r)=|\partial B_r|^{-1}\int_{\partial B_r}\varphi_i$. Therefore, 0 is an isolated simple blow up point of φ_i.

We claim that

$$\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(x)\to\frac{a}{|x|^{n-2\sigma}}+a\quad\text{in } C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}). \tag{62}$$

where a is as in (51) with $K_i(0)$ replaced by $K_i(0)H_i(0)$.

By the equation of φ_i, we have for all $|x|\le 1/\mu_i$

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(x)&=\varphi_i(0)^{1-p_i}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)(\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(y))^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y\\&=\varphi_i(0)^{1-p_i}\left(\int_{B_t}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_t}\frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)(\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(y))^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $t>1$ is an arbitrarily fixed constant. By the same proof of Corollary 2.19 we have, up to a subsequence,

$$\varphi_i(0)^{1-p_i}\int_{B_t}\frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)(\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(y))^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y\to\frac{a}{|x|^{n-2\sigma}}\quad\text{in } C^2_{loc}(B_t\setminus\{0\}),$$

and

$$h_i(x):=\varphi_i(0)^{1-p_i}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_t}\frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)(\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(y))^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y\to h(x)\ge 0\quad\text{in } C^2_{loc}(B_t).$$

For any fixed large $R>0$, by Proposition 2.17 and Lemma 2.10 we conclude that $\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(x)\le C(t,R)$ for all $t\le|x|\le R$. Hence, for $x\in B_t$, we have

$$\varphi_i(0)^{1-p_i}\int_{t\le|y|\le R}\frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)(\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(y))^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y\to 0\quad\text{as } i\to\infty.$$

Meanwhile, for any $x',x''\in B_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_R}\frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)(\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(y))^{p_i}}{|x'-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y\\&\qquad\le\left(\frac{R+t}{R-t}\right)^{n-2\sigma}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_R}\frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)(\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(y))^{p_i}}{|x''-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$h(x') \le \left(\frac{R+t}{R-t}\right)^{n-2\sigma} h(x'').$$

By sending $R \to \infty$ and exchanging the roles of x' and x'', we have $h(x'') = h(x')$. Thus,

$$h(x) \equiv h(0) \quad \text{for all } x \in B_t.$$

Since

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\left\{r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\varphi_i(0)\overline{\varphi}_i(r)\right\}\Big|_{r=1} = \varphi_i(0)\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\left\{r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{\varphi}_i(r)\right\}\Big|_{r=1} = 0,$$

we have, by sending i to ∞, that

$$h(0) = a > 0.$$

Therefore, (62) follows.

We are going to derive a contradiction to the Pohozaev identity in Proposition 2.15. Since $\frac{n-2\sigma}{2} - \frac{n}{p_i+1} \le 0$, by Corollary 2.23, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{i\to\infty} \varphi_i(0)^2\Big((\frac{n-2\sigma}{2} - \frac{n}{p_i+1})\int_{B_\delta} \tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}\varphi_i^{p_i+1} \\ - \frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{B_\delta} x\nabla(\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i})\varphi_i^{p_i+1}\Big) \le 0,\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

where $\tilde{K}_i$ satisfies the condition (i) of Corollary 2.23 .

On the other hand, if we let

$$b_i(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_\delta} \frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y,$$

then $\varphi_i(0)b_i(x) \ge h_i(x) \ge 2^{2\sigma-n}h_i(0) \to 2^{2\sigma-n}a$ for $x \in B_\delta$ provided that δ is small, and

$$|\nabla b_i(x)| \le \begin{cases} C\frac{|\delta^{2\sigma-1} - (\delta - |x-x_i|)^{2\sigma-1}|}{|2\sigma-1|}m_i^{-1} & \text{if } \sigma \ne 1/2 \\ C|\log\delta - \log(\delta-|x-x_i|)|m_i^{-1} & \text{if } \sigma = 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Hence, it follows from Proposition 2.11, Lemma 2.16 and Proposition 2.17 that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_\delta} \tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}^{\tau_i}\varphi_i^{p_i}b_i &\ge C^{-1}a\varphi_i(0)^{-1}\int_{B_{\varphi_i(0)^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}}} \varphi_i^{p_i} \\ &\ge C^{-1}\varphi_i(0)^{-2}\int_{B_1}(1+|x|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2},\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

$$\left|\int_{B_\delta} x\nabla b_i \tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}^{\tau_i}\varphi_i^{p_i}\right| \le C\varphi_i(0)^{-1}\int_{B_\delta}|x|\varphi_i^{p_i} = o(1)\varphi_i(0)^{-2}, \tag{65}$$

and

$$\int_{\partial B_\delta} \tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}\varphi_i^{p_i+1} \le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}. \tag{66}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{i\to\infty}\varphi_i(0)^2\Big(&\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}\int_{B_\delta}\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}^{\tau_i}\varphi_i^{p_i}b_i\\ &+\int_{B_\delta}x\nabla b_i\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}^{\tau_i}\varphi_i^{p_i}-\frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{\partial B_\delta}\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}\varphi_i^{p_i+1}\Big)>0,\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

which contradicts (63) and the Pohozaev identity in Proposition 2.15. □

In Lemma 2.21, we have obtained a decay estimate for $|\nabla K_i(x_i)|$ as $i\to\infty$. If one just wants to show $|\nabla K_i(x_i)|\to 0$, then it does not need $x_i\to 0$ to be simple nor K_i satisfying the flatness condition.

Proposition 2.25. *Suppose the assumptions in Proposition 2.24 hold except the $(*)'_{n-2\sigma}$ condition for K_i. Then*

$$|\nabla K_i(x_i)|\to 0 \quad \textit{as } i\to\infty.$$

Proof. Suppose that contrary that

$$|\nabla K_i(x_i)|\to d>0. \tag{68}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $x_i=0$. There are two cases.

Case 1. 0 is an isolated simple blow up point.

In this case, we argue as in the proof of Lemma 2.21. Similar to (60), we obtain

$$\left|\int_{B_1}\nabla K_i H_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}\right| \le Cu_i^{-2}(0)+C\tau_i.$$

It follows from the triangle inequality, uniform continuity of ∇K_i and Corollary 2.18 that

$$|\nabla K_i(0)| \le C\int_{B_1}|\nabla K_i(x)-\nabla K_i(0)|H_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}+o(1)=o(1).$$

Case 2. 0 is not an isolated simple blow up point.

In this case we argue as in the proof of Proposition 2.24. The only difference is that we cannot derive (63) from Corollary 2.23, since $(*)'_{n-2\sigma}$ condition for K_i is not assumed. Instead, we will use the condition (68) to show (63).

Let μ_i, φ_i, $\tilde{K}_i$ and $\tilde{H}_i$ be as in the proof of Proposition 2.24. Now we estimate the integral term $\int_{B_\delta} \langle y, \nabla(\tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i})\rangle \varphi_i^{p_i+1}$. Arguing the same as in the proof of Lemma 2.20 and using Corollary 2.18, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_i &\le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2} + C\int_{B_\delta} |y||\nabla \tilde{K}_i(y)| H_i^{\tau_i}\varphi_i^{p_i+1} \\ &\le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2} + C\mu_i\varphi_i(0)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}.\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (60),

$$\left|\int_{B_\delta} \nabla \tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}\varphi_i^{p_i+1}\right| \le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2} + C\tau_i.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla \tilde{K}_i(0)| &\le C\int_{B_\delta} |\nabla \tilde{K}_i(y) - \nabla \tilde{K}_i(0)|\varphi_i^{p_i+1} + C\varphi_i(0)^{-2} + C\tau_i \\ &\le o(\mu_i) + C\varphi_i(0)^{-2} + C\tau_i.\end{aligned}$$

Since $|\nabla \tilde{K}_i(0)| = \mu_i |\nabla K_i(0)| \ge (d/2)\mu_i$, we have

$$\mu_i \le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2} + C\tau_i.$$

It follows that

$$\tau_i \le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_i \le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2}. \tag{69}$$

Therefore,

$$\left|\int_{B_\delta} \langle y, \nabla(\tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i})\rangle \varphi_i^{p_i+1}\right| \le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2-2/(n-2\sigma)},$$

from which (63) follows.

Clearly, we have (64) - (66). So we obtain a contradiction by the Pohozaev identity in Proposition 2.15.

In conclusion, we complete the proof. □

3 Global analysis on the sphere

Recall that the stereographic projection from $\mathbb{S}^n \backslash \{N\}$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the inverse of

$$F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{S}^n \setminus \{N\}, \quad x \mapsto \left(\frac{2x}{1+|x|^2}, \frac{|x|^2-1}{|x|^2+1}\right),$$

where N is the north pole of $\mathbb{S}^n$, and its Jacobi determinant takes

$$|J_F| = \Big(\frac{2}{1+|x|^2}\Big)^n.$$

Via the stereographic projection, the equation

$$v(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \frac{K(\eta)v(\eta)^p}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}\eta \quad \text{for } \xi \in \mathbb{S}^n \tag{70}$$

is translated to

$$u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K(y)H(y)^\tau u(y)^p}{|x - y|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}y \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{71}$$

where

$$H(x) := |J_F(x)|^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}} = \Big(\frac{2}{1+|x|^2}\Big)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}, \tag{72}$$

$u(x) = H(x)v(F(x))$, $K(x) = K(F(x))$ and $\tau = \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma} - p \geq 0$.

3.1 Finite blow up points and uniform energy bound

We assume that K satisfies

$$A_1^{-1} \leq K \leq A_1 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n, \tag{73}$$

and

$$\|K\|_{C^1(\mathbb{S}^n)} \leq A_2. \tag{74}$$

To ensure the solutions of (70) to be of C^2, we further assume that

$$\|K\|_{C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)} \leq A_2, \quad \text{if } \sigma \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{75}$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let $v \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be a positive solution of (70). For any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $R > 1$, there exist large positive constants C_1^*, C_2^* depending on $n, \sigma, A_1, A_2, \varepsilon$ and R such that, if*

$$\max_{\mathbb{S}^n} v \geq C_1^*,$$

then there exists an integer $1 \leq l = l(v) < \infty$ and a set

$$\Gamma_v = \{P_1, \ldots, P_l\} \subset \mathbb{S}^n$$

$(P_j = P_j(v))$ such that
(i). $0 \leq \tau := \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma} - p < \varepsilon$,
(ii). If $P_1, \ldots, P_l$ are local maximums of v and for each $1 \leq j \leq l$, let $\{z_1, \cdots, z_n\}$ be a geodesic normal coordinate system centered at P_j, we have,

$$\|v^{-1}(P_j)v(v^{-\frac{(p-1)}{2\sigma}}(P_j)z) - (1 + k|z|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2}\|_{C^2(B_{2R})} \leq \varepsilon, \tag{76}$$

where $k = \Big(\frac{K(P_j)\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(\sigma)}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\sigma)}\Big)^{1/\sigma}$, and

$$\{B_{Rv(P_j)^{-(p-1)/2\sigma}}(P_j)\} \quad \textit{are disjoint balls}.$$

(iii). $v(P) \leq C_2^*\{\mathit{dist}(P, \Gamma_v)\}^{-2\sigma/(p-1)}$ for all $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$.

Proof. Given Theorem 1.4 in [84] and the proof of Proposition 2.11, the proof of Proposition 3.1 is similar to that of Proposition 4.1 in [82] and Lemma 3.1 in [100], and is omitted here. We refer to [82] and [100] for details. □

Proposition 3.2. *Assume the hypotheses in Proposition 3.1. Suppose that there exists some constant $d > 0$ such that K satisfies $(*)'_{n-2\sigma}$ for some L in $\Omega_d = \{P \in \mathbb{S}^n : |\nabla K(P)| < d\}$. Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$, $R > 1$ and any solution v of* (70) *with $\max_{\mathbb{S}^n} v > C_1^*$, we have*

$$|P_1 - P_2| \geq \delta^* > 0, \quad \text{for any } P_1, P_2 \in \Gamma_v \text{ and } P_1 \neq P_2,$$

where δ^* depends only on $n, \sigma, \varepsilon, R, A_1, A_2, L_2, d$, and the modulus of continuity of ∇K if $\sigma > 1/2$.

Proof. If we suppose the contrary, then there exist sequences of $\{p_i\}$ and $\{K_i\}$ satisfying the above assumptions, and a sequence of corresponding solutions $\{v_i\}$ such that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} |P_{1i} - P_{2i}| = 0, \tag{77}$$

where $P_{1i}, P_{2i} \in \Gamma_{v_i}$, and $|P_{1i} - P_{2i}| = \min\limits_{\substack{P_1, P_2 \in \Gamma_{v_i} \\ P_1 \neq P_2}} |P_1 - P_2|$.

Since $B_{Rv_i(P_{1i})^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}}(P_{1i})$ and $B_{Rv_i(P_{2i})^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}}(P_{2i})$ have to be disjoint, we have, because of (77), that $v_i(P_{1i}) \to \infty$ and $v_i(P_{2i}) \to \infty$. Therefore, we can pass to a subsequence (still denoted as v_i) with $R_i \to \infty$, $\varepsilon_i \to 0$ as in Proposition 2.11 (ε_i depending on R_i can be chosen as small as we need in the following arguments) such that, for z being any geodesic normal coordinate system centered at $P_{ji},\ j = 1, 2$, we have

$$\|m_i^{-1} v_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} z) - (1 + k_{ji}|z|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2}\|_{C^2(B_{2R_i}(0))} \leq \varepsilon_i, \tag{78}$$

where $m_i = v_i(0)$, $k_{ji} = \left(\frac{K(P_{ji})\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(\sigma)}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+\sigma)}\right)^{1/\sigma}$, $j = 1, 2; i = 1, 2, \ldots$.

In the stereographic coordinates with P_{1i} being the south pole, the equation (70) is transformed into

$$u_i(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K_i(y) H(y)^{\tau_i} u_i(y)^{p_1}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\, \mathrm{d}y \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{79}$$

where $u_i(x) = H(x) v_i(F(x))$. Let us still use $P_{2i} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to denote the stereographic coordinates of $P_{2i} \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and set $\vartheta_i := |P_{2i}| \to 0$. For simplicity, we assume P_{2i} is a local maximum point of u_i, since we can always reselect a sequence of points to substitute P_{2i}.

From (ii) in Proposition 3.1, there exists some constant C depending only on n, σ, such that

$$\vartheta_i > \frac{1}{C} \max\{R_i u_i(0)^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}, R_i u_i(P_{2i})^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}\}. \tag{80}$$

Set

$$\varphi_i(y) = \vartheta_i^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(\vartheta_i y) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It is easy to see that φ_i is positive in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and satisfies

$$\varphi_i(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)^{\tau_i}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{81}$$

where $\tilde{K}_i(x) = K_i(\vartheta_i x)$, $\tilde{H}_i(x) = H(\vartheta_i x)$. By Proposition 3.1, we have u_i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(x) &\le C_2|x|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \quad \text{for all } |x| \le \vartheta_i/2 \\ u_i(y) &\le C_2|y-P_{2i}|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \quad \text{for all } |y-P_{2i}| \le \vartheta_i/2. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (80), we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i\to\infty} \varphi_i(0) = \infty, \quad \lim_{i\to\infty} \varphi_i(|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i}) = \infty, \\ |x|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\varphi_i(x) \le C_2^*, \quad |x| \le 1/2, \\ |x-|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i}|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\varphi_i(x) \le C_2^*, \quad |x-|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i}| \le 1/2. \end{aligned}$$

After passing a subsequence, if necessary, there exists a point $\overline{P} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|\overline{P}| = 1$ such that $|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i} \to \overline{P}$ as $i \to \infty$. Hence 0 and $\overline{P}$ are both isolated blow up points of φ_i.

Actually, 0 and $|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i} \to \overline{P}$ are both isolated simple blow up points of φ_i. Indeed, If $|\nabla K_i(0)| < d/2$, then 0 is an isolated simple blow up point of φ_i because the $(*)_{n-2\sigma}$ condition holds in the region Ω_d and one can apply Proposition 2.24 to conclude it. If $|\nabla K_i(0)| \ge d/2$, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 2.25 one can still conclude that 0 is an isolated simple blow up point of φ_i. Similarly, $\overline{P}$ is also an isolated simple blow up point of φ_i.

It follows from Corollary 2.19 that for all $x \in \left(B_{1/2} \cup B_{1/2}(\overline{P})\right) \setminus \{0, \overline{P}\}$

$$\varphi_i(0)\int_{B_{1/2}} \frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)^{\tau_i}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \to a(0)|x|^{2\sigma-n} \tag{82}$$

and

$$\varphi_i(|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i})\int_{B_{1/2}(|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i})} \frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)^{\tau_i}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y \to a(\overline{P})|x-\overline{P}|^{2\sigma-n}, \tag{83}$$

where $a(0) > 0$ and $a(\overline{P}) > 0$ are as in (51). It follows from Proposition 2.17, (82) and (83) that

$$C^{-1} \le \varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(P_{2i}/(2|P_{2i}|)) \le C, \quad C^{-1} \le \varphi_i(P_{2i}/|P_{2i}|)\varphi_i(P_{2i}/(2|P_{2i}|)) \le C,$$

and thus,

$$C^{-1}\varphi_i(|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i}) \le \varphi_i(0) \le C\varphi_i(|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i}), \tag{84}$$

where $C = C(n, \sigma, A_1, A_2) > 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_i(0)\varphi_i(x) = \varphi_i(0)\Big(&\int_{B_{1/2}} + \int_{B_{1/2}(|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i})} \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus(B_{1/2}\cup B_{1/2}(|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i})} \frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)^{\tau_i}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y\Big) \\ &\to a(0)|x|^{2\sigma-n} + a(\overline{P})'|x-\overline{P}|^{2\sigma-n} + h(x),\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where $a(\overline{P})' \ge C^{-1}a(\overline{P}) > 0$ by (84), and $0 \le h(x) \in C^2(B_{1/2}\cup B_{1/2}(\overline{P}))$.

If we let

$$b_i(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_{1/2}} \frac{\tilde{K}_i(y)\tilde{H}_i(y)^{\tau_i}\varphi_i(y)^{p_i}}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}y,$$

then

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \varphi_i(0)b_i(x) = a(\overline{P})'|x-\overline{P}|^{2\sigma-n} + h(x) \ge c_0 > 0 \quad \text{in } B_{1/2}.$$

Thus, if $|\nabla K_i(0)| < d/2$, we can obtain a contradiction by using the Phozaev identity as (63)-(67) in the proof of Proposition 2.24. In the case that $|\nabla K_i(0)| \ge d/2$, we still can derive a contradiction since $\vartheta_i \le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2}$, $\tau_i \le C\varphi_i(0)^{-2}$ as in the proof of (69) in Proposition 2.25.

Therefore, the proposition is proved. □

3.2 Compactness

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} P_\sigma(v_i) &= c(n,\sigma)K_i v_i^{p_i} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n, \\ v_i &> 0, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n, \\ p_i &= \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma} - \tau_i, \quad \tau_i \ge 0, \tau_i \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

By (5), (86) is equivalent to

$$v_i(\xi) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+2\sigma}{2})}{2^{2\sigma}\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(\sigma)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \frac{K_i(\eta)v_i(\eta)^p}{|\xi-\eta|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}\eta \quad \text{for } \xi \in \mathbb{S}^n. \tag{87}$$

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose K_i satisfies the assumptions of K in Proposition 3.2. Let v_i be solutions of* (86)*. Then we have*

$$\|v_i\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)} \le C, \tag{88}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, A_1, A_2, L, d$ and the modulus of continuity of $\nabla_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} K_i$ if $\sigma > 1/2$. Furthermore, after passing to a subsequence, either $\{v_i\}$ stays bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ or $\{v_i\}$ has only isolated simple blow up points and the distance between any two blow up points is bounded blow by some positive constant depending only on $n, \sigma, A_1, A_2, L, d$ and the modulus of continuity of ∇K_i if $\sigma > 1/2$.

Proof. The theorem follows immediately from Proposition 3.2, Proposition 2.25, Proposition 2.11, Proposition 2.24 and Corollary 2.18. □

Proof of Theorem 1.6. It follows immediately from Theorem 3.3. □

In the next theorem, we impose a stronger condition on K_i such that $\{u_i\}$ has at most one blow up point.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose the assumptions in Theorem 3.3. Suppose further that $\{K_i\}$ satisfies $(*)'_{n-2\sigma}$ condition for some sequences $L(n-2\sigma, i) = o(1)$ in $\Omega_{d,i} = \{q \in \mathbb{S}^n : |\nabla_{g_0} K_i| < d\}$ or $\{K_i\}$ satisfies $(*)'_\beta$ condition with $\beta \in (n-2\sigma, n)$ in $\Omega_{d,i}$. Then, after passing to a subsequence, either $\{v_i\}$ stays bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ or $\{v_i\}$ has precisely one isolated simple blow up point.*

Proof. The strategy is the same as the proof of Proposition 3.2. We assume there are two isolated blow up points. After some transformation, we can assume that they are in the same half sphere. The condition of $\{K_i\}$ guarantees that Corollary 2.23 holds for u_i, where u_i is as below (72). Hence (63) holds for u_i. Meanwhile, (67) for u_i is also valid, since the distance between these blow up points is uniformly lower bounded which is due to Proposition 3.2. This reaches a contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 1.7. It follows from Theorem 3.4. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let v_i be positive solutions of* (86)*. Suppose that $\{K_i\} \subset C^1(\mathbb{S}^n)$ satisfies* (74)-(75)*, and for some point $P_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $A_1 > 0$ independent of i and $1 < \beta < n$, that*

$$\{K_i\} \text{ is bounded in } C^{[\beta],\beta-[\beta]}(B_{\varepsilon_0}(q_0)), \qquad K_i(P_0) \geq A_1$$

and

$$K_i(y) = K_i(0) + Q_i^{(\beta)}(y) + R_i(y), \quad |y| \leq \varepsilon_0,$$

where y is a geodesic normal coordinates system centered at P_0, $Q_i^{(\beta)}(y)$ satisfies $Q_i^{(\beta)}(\lambda y) = \lambda^\beta Q_i^{(\beta)}(y), \forall \lambda > 0,\ y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $R_i(y)$ satisfies

$$\sum_{s=0}^{[\beta]} |\nabla^s R_i(y)||y|^{-\beta+s} \to 0$$

uniformly in i as $y \to 0$.

Suppose also that $Q_i^{(\beta)} \to Q^{(\beta)}$ in $C^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and for some positive constant A_6 that

$$A_6|y|^{\beta-1} \le |\nabla Q^{(\beta)}(y)|, \quad |y| \le \varepsilon_0, \tag{89}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla Q^{(\beta)}(y+y_0)(1+|y|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} Q^{(\beta)}(y+y_0)(1+|y|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}y \end{pmatrix} \neq 0, \quad \forall\, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{90}$$

If P_0 is an isolated simple blow up point of v_i, then v_i has to have at least another blow up point.

Proof. The proof is by checking the "balance" condition of Kazdan-Warner type (10). It is the same as that of Theorem 5.3 in [73]. □

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that $K \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^n)$ ($K \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ if $0 < \sigma \le 1/2$), for some constant $A_1 > 0$,*

$$1/A_1 \le K(\xi) \le A_1 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{S}^n.$$

Suppose also that for any critical point ξ_0 of K and a geodesic normal coordinates system $\{y_1, \cdots, y_n\}$ centered at ξ_0, there exist some small neighborhood $\mathscr{O}$ of 0, a positive constant L, and $\beta = \beta(\xi_0) \in (n-2\sigma, n)$ such that

$$\|\nabla^{[\beta]} K\|_{C^{\beta-[\beta]}(\mathscr{O})} \le L$$

and

$$K(y) = K(0) + Q^{(\beta)}_{(\xi_0)}(y) + R_{(\xi_0)}(y) \quad \text{in } \mathscr{O},$$

where $Q^{(\beta)}_{\xi_0}(y) \in C^{[\beta]-1,1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ satisfies $Q^{(\beta)}_{\xi_0}(\lambda y) = \lambda^\beta Q^{(\beta)}_{\xi_0}(y)$, $\forall \lambda > 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and for some positive constant A_6

$$A_6|y|^{\beta-1} \le |\nabla Q^{(\beta)}_{\xi_0}(y)|, \quad y \in \mathscr{O},$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla Q^{(\beta)}_{\xi_0}(y+y_0)(1+|y|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} Q^{(\beta)}_{\xi_0}(y+y_0)(1+|y|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}y \end{pmatrix} \neq 0, \quad \forall\, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and $R_{\xi_0}(y) \in C^{[\beta]-1,1}(\mathscr{O})$ satisfies $\lim_{y\to 0} \sum_{s=0}^{[\beta]} |\nabla^s R_{\xi_0}(y)||y|^{-\beta+s} = 0$.

Then there exists a positive constant $C \ge 1$ depending on n, σ, K such that for every solution v of (1) there holds

$$1/C \le v \le C, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n.$$

Proof. It follows directly from Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.5. □

Proof of the compactness part of Theorem 1.4. It is easy to check that, if K satisfies the condition in Theorem 1.4, then it must satisfy the condition in the above theorem. Therefore, we have the lower and upper bounds of v. The C^2 norm bound of v follows immediately. □

4 Existence

4.1 Positivity of minimizers

Let $f \in L^p(\mathbb{S}^n)$ for $p \in (1, \infty)$. We say $v \in L^1(\mathbb{S}^n)$ is a weak solution of

$$P_\sigma v = f \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n, \tag{91}$$

if for any $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ there holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} v P_\sigma(\varphi) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} f\varphi. \tag{92}$$

On the other hand, for any $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ if we let

$$\varphi(\xi) = I^\sigma(g) = c_{n,\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \frac{g}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}\eta,$$

then by (5) and Fubini theorem, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} vg = \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} I^\sigma(f) g,$$

This implies

$$v(\xi) = I^\sigma(f)(\xi) = c_{n,\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \frac{f}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}\eta \quad a.e.\ \xi \in \mathbb{S}^n. \tag{93}$$

Consequently, if $f \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$ then $v \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$, and if in addition that $f \not\equiv 0$ then $v > 0$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$. By Riesz potential theory, $v \in H^{\sigma,p}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ if $p > 1$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let K satisfy* (73)-(75), $1 < p < \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$ *and*

$$Q_p[v] := \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} v P_\sigma v}{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|v|^{p+1})^{2/(p+1)}} \quad \textit{for } v \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n) \setminus \{0\}.$$

Then the minimum

$$Q_p := \inf_{v \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)} Q_p[v]$$

is achieved by some positive function v_p in $H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$.

Proof. Since the Sobolev embedding $H^\sigma \hookrightarrow L^{p+1}$ is compact, the existence of minimizer v_p follows from standard variational arguments. Also, it satisfies that

$$P_\sigma(v_p) = Q_p K |v_p|^{p-1} v_p \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|v_p|^{p+1} = 1.$$

We only need to show the positivity of v_p, which follows from the proof of Proposition 5 in [94].

Indeed, let w_p be such that $P_\sigma(w_p) = |P_\sigma(v_p)| = Q_p K|v_p|^p$. This implies that $P_\sigma(w_p \pm v_p) \geq 0$, and thus, $w_p \geq \pm v_p$, i.e., $w_p \geq |v_p|$. Since $v_p \not\equiv 0$, we have $w_p > 0$. Since Q_p is the minimum,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_p \leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} w_p P_\sigma(w_p)}{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|w_p|^{p+1})^{2/(p+1)}} &= \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} w_p Q_p K|v_p|^p}{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|w_p|^{p+1})^{2/(p+1)}} \\ &\leq Q_p \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|v_p|^{p+1}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|w_p|^{p+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}}}{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|w_p|^{p+1})^{2/(p+1)}} \\ &\leq Q_p. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that all these inequalities are actually equalities. Thus, $|v_p| = w_p > 0$, which means that v_p does not change sign. So we may assume that v_p is positive. □

Proposition 4.2. *Let $v \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be a solutions of*

$$P_\sigma v = K|v|^{\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} v \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n,$$

where $0 \leq K \leq A_1$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$. There exists $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, \sigma, A_1) > 0$ such that if the negative part of v satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} |v^-|^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \leq \varepsilon_0$, then $v \geq 0$.

Proof. It follows that v satisfies

$$v(\xi) = c_{n,\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \frac{K(\eta)|v|^{\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} v}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}\eta.$$

Multiplying both sides by $-(v^-)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}$ and integrating over $\mathbb{S}^n$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} (v^-)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} &= -c_{n,\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \frac{K(\eta)|v(\eta)|^{\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} v(\eta)(v^-(\xi))^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}\eta \mathrm{d}\xi \\ &\leq c_{n,\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \frac{K(\eta)(v^-(\eta))^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} (v^-(\xi))^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}\eta \mathrm{d}\xi \\ &\leq C(n, \sigma, A_1) \|(v^-)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{n+2\sigma}}} \\ &= C(n, \sigma, A_1) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} (v^-)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality on $\mathbb{S}^n$ (see, e.g., [85]). Therefore, if $\varepsilon_0 < C(n, \sigma, A_1)^{-n/2\sigma}$, then $v^- \equiv 0$. □

4.2 Existence for antipodally symmetric functions

In this section, we shall prove Theorem 1.2, which is for antipodally symmetric functions K.

Let H^σ_{as} be the set of antipodally symmetric functions in $H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$, and let

$$\lambda_{as}(K) = \inf_{v\in H^\sigma_{as}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} vP_\sigma(v) : \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|v|^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} = 1 \right\}.$$

We also denote ω_n as the volume of $\mathbb{S}^n$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is divided into two steps.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $0 \le K \in C^0(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be antipodally symmetric. If*

$$\lambda_{as}(K) < \frac{P_\sigma(1)\omega_n^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}} 2^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}}}{(\max_{\mathbb{S}^n} K)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}}}, \tag{94}$$

then there exists a positive and antipodally symmetric $C^{2\sigma^*}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ solution of (1)*, where $\sigma^* = \sigma$ if $2\sigma \notin \mathbb{N}^+$ and otherwise $0 < \sigma^* < \sigma$.*

Proposition 4.4. *Let $0 \le K \in C^0(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be antipodally symmetric. If there exists a maximum point of K at which K has flatness order greater than $n - 2\sigma$, then*

$$\lambda_{as}(K) < \frac{P_\sigma(1)\omega_n^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}} 2^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}}}{(\max_{\mathbb{S}^n} K)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}}}. \tag{95}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. It follows from Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4. □

The proof of Proposition 4.3 uses subcritical approximations. For $1 < p < \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$, we define

$$\lambda_{as,p}(K) = \inf_{v\in H^\sigma_{as}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} vP_\sigma(v) : \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|v|^{p+1} = 1 \right\}.$$

We begin with a lemma

Lemma 4.5. *Assume K as that in Proposition 4.3. Then $\lambda_{as,p}(K)$ is achieved by a positive and antipodally symmetric $C^{2\sigma^*}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ function v_p, which satisfies*

$$P_\sigma(v_p) = \lambda_{as,p}(K) K v_p^p \quad \textit{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K v_p^{p+1} = 1. \tag{96}$$

Proof. The existence of a positive solution v_p in $H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$ can be found by considering the minimizing problem as that in Proposition 4.1. The regularity of v_p follows from Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.6 and a standard result of Riesz potential. □

Proof of Proposition 4.3. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 2.1 in [74], and here we just sketch the proof. First of all, we have

$$\limsup_{p\to\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \lambda_{as,p}(K) \le \lambda_{as}(K).$$

Hence, we may assume that there exists a sequence $\{p_i\} \to \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$ such that $\lambda_{as,p_i}(K) \to \lambda$ for some $\lambda \le \lambda_{as}(K)$. Since $\{v_i\}$, which is a sequence of minimizers in Lemma 4.5 for $p = p_i$, is bounded in $H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$, then there exists $v \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$ such that $v_i \rightharpoonup v$ weakly in $H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$ and v is nonnegative. If $v \not\equiv 0$, it follows from the integral equation of v that $v > 0$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$, and we are done. Now we suppose that $v \equiv 0$. If $\{\|v_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)}\}$ is bounded, by Theorem 2.6 we have $\{\|v_i\|_{C^{2\sigma^*}(\mathbb{S}^n)}\}$ is bounded, too. Therefore, $v_i \to 0$ in $C^0(\mathbb{S}^n)$ which leads to $1 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|v_i|^{p_i+1} \to 0$. This is a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $v_i(x_i) := \max_{\mathbb{S}^n} v_i \to \infty$. Since $\mathbb{S}^n$ is compact, there exists a subsequence of $\{x_i\}$, which will be still denoted as $\{x_i\}$, and $\bar{x}$ such that $x_i \to \bar{x}$. Without loss of generality we assume that $\bar{x}$ is the south pole. Via the stereographic projection F^{-1}, (96) becomes

$$u_i(y) = c_{n,\sigma}\lambda_{as,p_i}(K) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\hat{K}_i(z)u_i^{p_i}(z)}{|y-z|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}z \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{97}$$

where $v_i \circ F(y) = (\frac{1+|y|^2}{2})^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} u_i(y)$, $\hat{K}_i(y) = H^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}-p_i}(y)K(F(y))$, and H is as in (72).

Thus for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u_i(y) \le 2^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} u_i(y_i)$ where $y_i := F^{-1}(x_i) \to 0$. For simplicity, we denote $m_i := u_i(y_i)$. By our assumption on v_i we have $m_i \to \infty$. Define

$$\tilde{u}_i(y) = m_i^{-1} u_i\big(m_i^{\frac{1-p_i}{2\sigma}} y + y_i\big).$$

From (97) we see that $\tilde{u}_i(y)$ satisfies

$$\tilde{u}_i(y) = c_{n,\sigma}\lambda_{as,p_i}(K) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\hat{K}_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1/2\sigma)}z + y_i)\tilde{u}_i^{p_i}(z)}{|y-z|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}z, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{98}$$

Since $0 < \tilde{u}_i \le 2^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}$ and $K \ge 0$, arguing exactly the same as the proof of Proposition 2.11 we have $\tilde{u}_i \to u$ in $C^{2\sigma}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $u(0) = 1$ and u satisfies

$$u(y) = c_{n,\sigma}\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{K(\bar{x})u(z)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}{|y-z|^{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}z. \tag{99}$$

Hence, $\lambda > 0$, $K(\bar{x}) > 0$, and the solutions of (99) are classified in [37] and [84].

Similar to the proof of Proposition 2.1 in [74], since $K \ge 0$ and v_i are antipodally symmetric, we have, by taking δ small,

$$1 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} Kv_i^{p_i+1} \ge 2\int_{\mathcal{B}(\bar{x},\delta)} Kv_i^{p_i+1} \ge 2K(\bar{x}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} + o(1), \tag{100}$$

where $\mathcal{B}(\bar{x},\delta)$ the geodesic ball of radius δ centered at $\bar{x}$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$. By the sharp Sobolev inequality (6) and the estimate (99), we have

$$P_\sigma(1)\omega_n^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}} \leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(-\Delta)^\sigma u}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}}} = \lambda K(\bar{x})\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}} \leq \lambda_{as}(K)2^{-\frac{2\sigma}{n}}(\max_{\mathbb{S}^n} K)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}},$$

which contradicts with (94). □

Next we shall prove Proposition 4.4 using some test functions, which are inspired by [68, 93].

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Let ξ_1 be a maximum point of K at which K has flatness order greater than $n-2\sigma$. Suppose ξ_2 is the antipodal point of ξ_1. For $\beta > 1$ and $i = 1, 2$ we define

$$v_{i,\beta}(x) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{\beta^2-1}}{\beta - \cos r_i}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}, \tag{101}$$

where $r_i = d(x,\xi_i)$ is the geodesic distance between x and ξ_i on the sphere. It is clear that

$$P_\sigma(v_{i,\beta}) = P_\sigma(1)v_{i,\beta}^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} v_{i,\beta}^{\frac{2n}{n-2\beta}} = \omega_n.$$

Let

$$v_\beta = v_{1,\beta} + v_{2,\beta},$$

which is antipodally symmetric. Then as in the proof of Proposition 2.2 in [74], we have

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} v_\beta P_\sigma(v_\beta)}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K v_\beta^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}}} \leq \frac{P_\sigma(1)\omega_n^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}}2^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}}}{K(\xi_1)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}}}\left(1 - \frac{A}{\omega_n}(\beta-1)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} + o\big((\beta-1)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}\big)\right),$$

for β close to 1,

$$A = 2^{-\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}\omega_{n-1}\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{2^n r^{n-1}}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{2}}}dr > 0.$$

This implies that (95) holds. □

Theorem 1.2 can be extended to positive functions K which are invariant under some isometry group acting without fixed points (see Hebey [68] and Robert [93]). Denote $Isom(\mathbb{S}^n)$ as the isometry group of the standard sphere $(\mathbb{S}^n, g_{\mathbb{S}^n})$. Let G be a subgroup of $Isom(\mathbb{S}^n)$. We say that G acts without fixed points if for each $x \in \mathbb{S}^n$, the orbit $O_G(x) := \{g(x) | g \in G\}$ has at least two elements. We denote $|O_G(x)|$ be the number of elements in $O_G(x)$. A function K is called G-invariant if $K \circ g \equiv K$ for all $g \in G$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $n \geq 2$, $0 < \sigma < n/2$, G be a finite subgroup of $Isom(\mathbb{S}^n)$ acting without fixed points. Let $K \in C^0(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be a positive and G-invariant function. If there exists $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n$ such that K has flatness order greater than $n-2\sigma$ at ξ_0, and for any $x \in \mathbb{S}^n$*

$$\frac{K(\xi_0)}{|O_G(\xi_0)|^{\frac{2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}} \geq \frac{K(x)}{|O_G(x)|^{\frac{2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}}, \tag{102}$$

then (1) *possesses a positive and G-invariant $C^{2\sigma^*}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ solution.*

The above theorem was proved by Hebey [68] for $\sigma = 1$ and Robert [93, 94] for σ being other integers.

Let H^σ_G be the set of G-invariant functions in $H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$. Let

$$\lambda_G(K) = \inf_{v \in H^\sigma_G} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} vP_\sigma(v) : \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|v|^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} = 1 \right\}.$$

Similar to Theorem 1.2, the proof of Theorem 4.6 is again divided into two steps.

Proposition 4.7. *Let G be a finite subgroup of $Isom(\mathbb{S}^n)$. Let $K \in C^0(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be a positive and G-invariant function. If for all $x \in \mathbb{S}^n$,*

$$\lambda_G(K) < \frac{P_\sigma(1)\omega_n^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}}|O_G(x)|^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}}}{K(x)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}}}, \tag{103}$$

then there exists a positive G-invariant $C^{2\sigma^*}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ solution of (1).

Proposition 4.8. *Let G be a finite subgroup of $Isom(\mathbb{S}^n)$ and act without fixed points. Let $K \in C^0(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be a positive and G-invariant function. If K has flatness order greater than $n-2\sigma$ at ξ_1 for some $\xi_1 \in \mathbb{S}^n$, then*

$$\lambda_G(K) < \frac{P_\sigma(1)\omega_n^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}}|O_G(\xi_1)|^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}}}{K(\xi_1)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}}}. \tag{104}$$

Theorem 4.6 follows from Proposition 4.7 and Proposition 4.8 immediately. The proof of Proposition 4.7 uses subcritical approximations and blow up analysis, which is similar to that of Proposition 4.3. Proposition 4.8 can be verified by the following G-invariant test function

$$v_\beta = \sum_{i=1}^m v_{i,\beta},$$

where $m = |O_G(\xi_1)|$, $O_G(\xi_1) = \{\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m\}$, $\xi_i = g_i(\xi_1)$ for some $g_i \in G$, $g_1 = Id$, $v_{j,\beta} := v_{1,\beta} \circ g_i^{-1}$ and $v_{1,\beta}$ is as in (101). We omit the detailed proofs of Propositions 4.7 and 4.8, and leave them to the readers.

4.3 Proof of the existence part of Theorem 1.4

Note that the interval $(n-2\sigma, n)$ is getting broader as σ increases. We split the problem into three cases.

Case 1. Let $\sigma_0 \in (0,1]$ and K satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1.4 for $\sigma = \sigma_0$.

Then K also satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 for every $\sigma \in [\sigma_0, 1]$. It follows from the compactness part of Theorem 1.4 that for every $\sigma \in [\sigma_0, 1]$ and all positive solution of (1), we have

$$C^{-1} \leq v \leq C, \tag{105}$$

where $C \geq 1$ depends only on n, σ_0, K but independent of σ. It was proved by Li [82] that

$$\deg\left(v - (P_1)^{-1} K v^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^n) \cap \{C^{-1} \leq v \leq C\}, 0\right) \neq 0 \tag{106}$$

for any $0 < \alpha < 1$. By Theorem 2.7 and a homotopy argument, we have for all $\sigma \in [\sigma_0, 1]$

$$\deg\left(v - (P_\sigma)^{-1} K v^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}, C^{2,\alpha'}(\mathbb{S}^n) \cap \{C^{-1} \leq v \leq C\}, 0\right) \neq 0$$

for some $0 < \alpha' < 1$. Therefore, (1) has a positive solution for $\sigma = \sigma_0$. Since σ_0 is arbitrary, (1) has a positive solution for all $\sigma \in (0,1)$.

Case 2. Let $\sigma_0 \in [1, n/2)$ and K satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1.4 for $\sigma = \sigma_0$, and with $\beta > n-2$.

Then K also satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 for every $\sigma \in [1, \sigma_0]$. Therefore, (105) still holds for all positive solution of (1) and for every $\sigma \in [1, \sigma_0]$, where $C \geq 1$ depends only on n, σ_0, K but independent of σ. Moreover, (106) still holds, and the arguments in Case 1 still apply. Therefore, we can also conclude that (1) has a positive solution in the case of $\sigma > 1$ and $\beta > n-2$.

Case 3. Let $\sigma_0 \in [1, n/2)$ and K satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1.4 for $\sigma = \sigma_0$, but with $\beta \in (n-2\sigma_0, n-2]$.

In this case, K does not satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 for all $\sigma \in [1, \sigma_0]$. If we still want to use the degree counting results of Li [82], we have to deform K properly.

Let $\eta : [0, \infty) \to [0,1]$ be a smooth cutoff function satisfying $\eta(t) = 1$ for $t \in [0,1]$, $\eta \equiv 0$ for $t \geq 2$ and $|\eta'| \leq 5$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $f \in C^1(B_1)$ satisfy*

$$f(x) = f(0) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i |x_i|^\beta + R(x),$$

where $a_i \neq 0$, $\beta > 1$, $R(x) \in C^{[\beta]-1,1}(B_1)$ *satisfies* $\sum_{s=0}^{[\beta]} |\nabla^s R(x)||x|^{-\beta+s} \to 0$ *as* $x \to 0$. *For* $\tau \in [0,1]$ *and* $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/4]$, *let*

$$f_{\varepsilon,\tau}(x) := f(x) - \tau R(x)\eta(|x|/\varepsilon).$$

Then there exists a constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ *such that* 0 *is the unique critical point of* $f_{\varepsilon_0,\tau}$ *in* $B_{2\varepsilon_0}$ *for every* $\tau \in [0,1]$.

Proof. For $x \in \overline{B}_\varepsilon$, we have $f_{\varepsilon,\tau}(x) = f(0) + \sum a_i|x_i|^\beta + (1-\tau)R(x)$. It follows from the assumption of R that 0 is the only critical point in $\overline{B}_\varepsilon$ provided ε is sufficiently small. For $x \in B_{2\varepsilon} \setminus B_\varepsilon$, we have

$$\frac{1}{|x|^{\beta-1}}|\nabla(R(x)\eta(|x|/\varepsilon))| \leq \frac{1}{|x|^{\beta-1}}|\nabla R(x)| + \frac{5}{|x|^{\beta-1}\varepsilon}|R(x)| \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

On the other hand, $\frac{1}{|x|^{\beta-1}}\beta \sum_i |a_i||x_i|^{\beta-1} > c > 0$. This completes the proof. □

Consequently, by Lemma 4.9, for those K satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 1.4, one can make a homotopy and deform K continuously to a function K_1 of the form (107) near each of its critical points, and along the homotopy it does not introduce new critical points and the hypotheses in Theorem 1.4 are still satisfied.

Corollary 4.10. *Let* K *satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1.4 for* $\sigma = \sigma_0$. *Then for every (small)* $d > 0$ *there exists a continuous* 1*-parameter family of functions* $\{K_\tau\} \subset C^1(\mathbb{S}^n)$, $\tau \in [0,1]$, *and* $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ *such that*

i). $K_0 = K$, *and* $K_\tau = K$ *in* $\{|\nabla K| \geq d > 0\}$ *for every* $\tau \in [0,1]$;

ii). *For every* $\tau \in [0,1]$, K_τ *has the same critical points as* K *does, and* K_τ *also satisfies the assumptions for* K *in Theorem 1.4;*

iii). *For every critical point of* K_1, *there exists a geodesic normal coordinates centered at it such that*

$$K_1(y) = K_1(0) + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i|y_i|^\beta \quad \text{in } B_{\varepsilon_0}, \tag{107}$$

where β *and* a_i *are the same as those of* K;

iv) K_τ *has uniform lower bound and* C^1 *bound in* τ, *and* ∇K_τ *has uniform modulus of continuity in* τ.

Recall that in *Case 3*, we have $\sigma_0 \in [1, n/2)$ and $\beta \in (n - 2\sigma_0, n-2]$. Now we can do another homotopy of the form, roughly speaking,

$$K_1^{(t)}(x) = K_1(0) + \sum_{i=1}^n a_j|x_j|^{(n-1-\beta)t+\beta}, \quad t \in [0,1],$$

near each critical point of K, where $K_1^{(0)} = K_1$. Once again we can make such a homotopy without introducing new critical points of K and keeping the hypothesis of Theorem 3.6 satisfied along the homotopy. This homotopy can be made as follows.

We let $b_1, b_2 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ satisfy $b_1' \geq 0$, $b_2' \geq 0$ and

$$b_1(t) = \begin{cases} t, & 0 < t \leq \varepsilon_0/8, \\ 1, & t \geq \varepsilon_0/4. \end{cases}, \quad b_2(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 < t \leq \varepsilon_0/2, \\ 1, & t \geq 7\varepsilon_0/8. \end{cases}$$

For $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, we define

$$F(z_1, \ldots, z_{n-1}) = \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 - b_2(|z_j|)).$$

and

$$F_i(x) = F(x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_n).$$

Let $t \in [0, 1]$. By Corollary 4.10, near every critical point of K, we deform K_1 (recall that $\beta \leq n - 2$) as

$$K_1^{(t)}(y) = K_1(0) + \sum_i^n \left(a_i b_1(|y_i|)^{(n-1-\beta)t} |y_i|^\beta F_i(y) + a_i |y_i|^\beta (1 - F_i(y)) \right).$$

It is clear that $K_1^{(0)} \equiv K_1$. Moreover, it follows that

- if $|y_i| \leq \varepsilon_0/8$ for every $i = 1, \cdots, n$, then we have $F_i(y) = 1$ and $b_1(|y_i|) = 1$. Therefore,

  $$K_1^{(t)}(y) = K_1(0) + \sum_i^n a_i |y_i|^{(n-1-\beta)t+\beta},$$

  and for every t, $K_1^{(t)}(y)$ does not have any critical point other than the origin.

- if there exists k such that $|y_k| \geq 7\varepsilon_0/8$, then we have $F_j(y) = 0$ when $j \neq k$, and $b_1(|y_k|) = 1$. Therefore, we have

  $$K_1^{(t)}(y) = K_1(0) + \sum_i^n a_i |y_i|^\beta,$$

  and for every t, $K_1^{(t)}(y)$ does not have an critical point.

- if $3\varepsilon_0/8 < |y_i| < 7\varepsilon_0/8$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, n$, we have $b_1(|y_i|) = 1$ for all i. Therefore

  $$K_1^{(t)}(y) = K_1(0) + \sum_i^n a_i |y_i|^\beta,$$

  and for every t, $K_1^{(t)}(y)$ does not have any critical point.

- if there exists k such that $|y_k| \leq 3\varepsilon_0/8$ (which is less than $\varepsilon_0/2$), then $F_j(y)$ is independent of y_k for all $j = 1, \cdots, n$. Therefore,

$$\partial_{y_k} K_1^{(t)}(y) = \partial_{y_k}\left(a_k b_1(|y_k|)^{(n-1-\beta)t}|y_k|^\beta\right) F_k(y) + \partial_{y_k}\left(a_k|y_k|^\beta\right)(1 - F_k(y)).$$

  Therefore, since $a_k \neq 0$ and $b_1' \geq 0$, the only possible points for $\partial_{y_k} K_1^{(t)}(y) = 0$ are for those $y_k = 0$. Now we can consider the function $K_1^{(t)}(y)$ for $y_k = 0$, where the structure of F_i will stay unchanged. If we run through the above four cases $n-1$ more times, we can conclude that for all $t \in [0,1]$, the only critical point for $K_1^{(t)}(y)$ is $y = 0$.

On one hand, it follows from the compactness result Theorem 3.6 that for all $\sigma \in [1, \sigma_0]$ and all solutions of

$$P_\sigma(v) = c(n,\sigma) K_1^{(1)} v^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}, \quad v > 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n,$$

there holds

$$C^{-1} \leq v \leq C,$$

where $C \geq 1$ depends only on n, σ_0, K but independent of σ. Therefore, it follows from (106) that

$$\deg\left(v - c(n,\sigma_0)(P_{\sigma_0})^{-1} K_1^{(1)} v^{\frac{n+2\sigma_0}{n-2\sigma_0}}, C^{2,\alpha'}(\mathbb{S}^n) \cap \{C^{-1} \leq v \leq C\}, 0\right) \neq 0 \tag{108}$$

for some $0 < \alpha' < 1$.

On the other hand, for all $t \in [0,1]$, and all the solutions of

$$P_{\sigma_0}(v) = c(n,\sigma_0) K_1^{(t)} v^{\frac{n+2\sigma_0}{n-2\sigma_0}}, \quad v > 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n,$$

there holds

$$C^{-1} \leq v \leq C,$$

where $C \geq 1$ depends only on n, σ_0, K but independent of t. Therefore, it follows from (108) that

$$\deg\left(v - c(n,\sigma_0)(P_{\sigma_0})^{-1} K_1^{(0)} v^{\frac{n+2\sigma_0}{n-2\sigma_0}}, C^{2,\alpha'}(\mathbb{S}^n) \cap \{C^{-1} \leq v \leq C\}, 0\right) \neq 0$$

for some $0 < \alpha' < 1$. Consequently, making use of the fact that $K_1^{(0)} \equiv K_1$, Corollary 4.10 and Theorem 3.6, we have

$$\deg\left(v - c(n,\sigma_0)(P_{\sigma_0})^{-1} K v^{\frac{n+2\sigma_0}{n-2\sigma_0}}, C^{2,\alpha'}(\mathbb{S}^n) \cap \{C^{-1} \leq v \leq C\}, 0\right) \neq 0$$

Therefore, we can also conclude that (1) has a positive solution in this last case. This finishes the proof of the existence part of Theorem 1.4 □

References

[1] Abdelhedi, W., Chtioui, H., Hajaiej, H.: A complete study of the lack of compactness and existence results of a Fractional Nirenberg Equation via a flatness hypothesis: Part I. arXiv:1409.5884.

[2] Aubin, T., Bahri, A.: Méthodes de topologie algébrique pour le problm̀e de la courbure scalaire prescrite. J. Math. Pures Appl. **76** (1997), 525–549.

[3] Aubin, T., Bahri, A.: Une hypothèse topologique pour le problème de la courbure scalaire prescrite. J. Math. Pures Appl. **76** (1997), 843–850.

[4] Aubin, T., Hebey, E.: Courbure scalaire prescrite. Bull. Sci. Math. **115** (1991), 125–131.

[5] Bahoura, S.S.: Harnack inequalities for Yamabe type equations. Bull. Sci. Math. **133** (2009), 875–892.

[6] Bahri, A., Coron, J.-M.: The scalar curvature problem on the standard three-dimensional sphere. J. Funct. Anal. **255** (1991), 106–172.

[7] Bahri, A., Li, Y.Y., Rey, O.: On a variational problem with lack of compactness: the topological effect of the critical points at infinity. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **3** (1995), 67–93.

[8] Baird, P., Fardoun, A., Regbaoui, R.: Q-curvature flow on 4-manifolds. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **27** (2006), no. 1, 75–104.

[9] ——: Prescribed Q-curvature on manifolds of even dimension. J. Geom. Phys. **59** (2009), no. 2, 221–233.

[10] Beckner, W.: Sharp Sobolev inequalities on the sphere and the Moser-Trudinger inequality. Ann. of Math. (2) **138** (1993), 213–242.

[11] Ben Ayed, M., Ould Ahmedou, M.O.: On the prescribed scalar curvature on 3-half spheres: multiplicity results and Morse inequalities at infinity. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **23** (2009), 655–683.

[12] Bourguignon, J.P., Ezin, J.P.: Scalar curvature functions in a conformal class of metrics and conformal transformations. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **301** (1987), 723–736.

[13] Branson, T.P.: Sharp inequalities, the functional determinant, and the complementary series. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **347** (1995), 367–3742.

[14] Brendle, S.: Prescribing a higher order conformal invariant on $\mathbb{S}^n$. Comm. Anal. Geom. **11** (2003), 837–858.

[15] ——: Global existence and convergence for a higher order flow in conformal geometry. Ann. of Math. (2) **158** (2003), no. 1, 323–343.

[16] Brezis, H., Kato, T.: Remarks on the Schrödinger operator with singular complex potentials. J. Math. Pures Appl. **58** (1979), 137–151

[17] Brezis, H., Nirenberg, L.: Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **36** (1983), 437–477.

[18] Byeon, J.: Effect of symmetry to the structure of positive solutions in nonlinear elliptic problems. III. Asymptot. Anal. **30** (2002), 249–272.

[19] Caffarelli, L.A., Jin, T.; Sire, Y., Xiong, J.: Local analysis of solutions of fractional semi-linear elliptic equations with isolated singularities. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **213** (2014), no. 1, 245–268.

[20] Caffarelli, L.A., Silvestre, L.: An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian. Comm. Partial. Diff. Equ., **32** (2007), 1245–1260

[21] Cao, D., Noussair, E.S., Yan, S.: On the scalar curvature equation $-\Delta u = (1+\epsilon K)u^{(N+2)/(N-2)}$ in R^N. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **15** (2002), 403–419.

[22] Case, J.; Chang, S.-Y.: On fractional GJMS operators. arXiv:1406.1846.

[23] Catrina, F., Wang, Z.-Q.: Symmetric solutions for the prescribed scalar curvature problem. Indiana

Univ. Math. J. **49** (2000), 779–813.
[24] Chang, K., Liu, J.: On Nirenberg's problem. Internat. J. Math. **4** (1993), 35–58.
[25] Chang, S.-Y., González, M.: Fractional Laplacian in conformal geometry. Adv. Math. **226** (2011), 1410–1432.
[26] Chang, S.-Y., Gursky, M.J., Yang, P.: The scalar curvature equation on 2- and 3-spheres. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **1** (1993), 205–229.
[27] ——: An equation of Monge-Ampère type in conformal geometry, and four-manifolds of positive Ricci curvature. Ann. of Math. (2) **155** (2002), no. 3, 709–787.
[28] Chang, S.-Y., Xu, X., Yang, P.: A perturbation result for prescribing mean curvature. Math. Ann. **310** (1998), 473–496.
[29] Chang, S.-Y., Yang, P.: Prescribing Gaussian curvature on $\mathbb{S}^2$. Acta Math. **159** (1987), 215–259.
[30] ——: Conformal deformation of metrics on $\mathbb{S}^2$. J. Differential Geom. **27** (1988), 259–296.
[31] ——: A perturbation result in prescribing scalar curvature on $\mathbb{S}^n$. Duke Math. J. **64** (1991), 27–69.
[32] ——: Extremal metrics of zeta function determinants on 4-manifolds. Ann. of Math. (2) **142** (1995), no. 1, 171–212.
[33] Chen, C.C., Lin, C.S. : Estimate of the conformal scalar curvature equation via the method of moving planes. II. J. Differential Geom. **49** (1998), 115–178.
[34] Chen, Y.-H., Liu, C., Zheng, Y.: Existence results for the fractional Nirenberg problem, `arXiv:1406.2770`.
[35] Chen, W., Ding, W.: Scalar curvatures on S^2. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **303** (1987), 365–382.
[36] Chen, W., Li, C.: A priori estimates for prescribing scalar curvature equations. Ann. of Math. (2) **145** (1997), 547–564.
[37] Chen, W., Li, C., Ou, B.: Classification of solutions for an integral equation. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **59** (2006), 330–343.
[38] Chen, X., Xu, X.: The scalar curvature flow on $\mathbb{S}^n$ — perturbation theorem revisited. Invent. Math. **187** (2012), no. 2, 395–506.
[39] ——: Q-curvature flow on the standard sphere of even dimension. J. Funct. Anal. **261** (2011), no. 4, 934–980.
[40] Chen, W., Zhu, J.: Indefinite fractional elliptic problem and Liouville theorems. `arXiv:1404.1640`.
[41] Djadli, Z., Hebey, E., Ledoux, M,: Paneitz-type operators and applications. Duke Math. J. **104** (2000), no. 1, 129–169.
[42] Djadli, Z., Malchiodi, A.: Existence of conformal metrics with constant Q-curvature. Ann. of Math. (2) **168** (2008), 813–858.
[43] Djadli, Z., Malchiodi, A., Ahmedou, M.O.: Prescribing a fourth order conformal invariant on the standard sphere. I. A perturbation result. Commun. Contemp. Math. **4** (2002), 375–408.
[44] ——: Prescribing a fourth order conformal invariant on the standard sphere. II. Blow up analysis and applications. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. **5** (2002), 387–434.
[45] ——: The prescribed boundary mean curvature problem on $\mathbb{B}^4$. J. Differential Equations **206** (2004), 373–398.
[46] Druet, O.: Elliptic equations with critical Sobolev exponents in dimension 3. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **19** (2002), 125–142.
[47] Escobar, J. F.: Conformal metrics with prescribed mean curvature on the boundary. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **4** (1996), 559–592.
[48] Escobar, J.F., Garcia, G.: Conformal metrics on the ball with zero scalar curvature and prescribed

mean curvature on the boundary. J. Funct. Anal. **211** (2004), 71–152.
[49] Escobar, J.F., Schoen, R. Conformal metrics with prescribed scalar curvature. Invent. Math. **86** (1986), 243–254.
[50] Esposito, P., Mancini, G.: A prescribed scalar curvature-type equation: almost critical manifolds and multiple solutions. J. Funct. Anal. **205** (2003), 306–356.
[51] Esposito, P., Robert, F.: Mountain pass critical points for Paneitz-Branson operators. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **15** (2002), no. 4, 493–517.
[52] Fang, F.: Infinitely many non-radial sign-changing solutions for a Fractional Laplacian equation with critical nonlinearity. `arXiv:1408.3187`.
[53] Fefferman, C., Graham, C. R.: Conformal invariants. The mathematical heritage of Élie Cartan (Lyon, 1984). Astérisque, Numero Hors Serie (1985), 95–116.
[54] ——: Juhl's formulae for GJMS operators and Q-curvatures, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **26** (2013), 1191–1207.
[55] Felli, V.: Existence of conformal metrics on $\mathbb{S}^n$ with prescribed fourth-order invariant. Adv. Differential Equations **7** (2002), 47–76.
[56] González, M., Mazzeo, R., Sire, Y.: Singular solutions of fractional order conformal Laplacians. J. Geom. Anal. **22** (2012), no. 3, 845–863.
[57] González, M., Qing, J.: Fractional conformal Laplacians and fractional Yamabe problems. Anal. PDE. **6** (2013), no. 7, 1535–1576.
[58] Graham, C.R., Jenne, R., Mason, L.J., Sparling, G.A.J.: Conformally invariant powers of the Laplacian I. Existence. J. London Math. Soc. **46** (1992), 557–565.
[59] Graham, C.R., Zworski, M.: Scattering matrix in conformal geometry. Invent. Math. **152** (2003), 89–118.
[60] Gursky, M., Malchiodi, A.: A strong maximum principle for the Paneitz operator and a non-local flow for the Q-curvature. `arXiv:1401.3216`.
[61] Han, Z.-C.: Prescribing Gaussian curvature on $\mathbb{S}^2$. Duke Math. J. **61** (1990), 679–703.
[62] Han, Z.-C., Li, Y.Y. : A note on the Kazdan-Warner type condition. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **13** (1996), 283–292.
[63] ——: The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary: existence and compactness results. Duke Math. J. **99** (1999), 489–542.
[64] ——: On the local solvability of the Nirenberg problem on $\mathbb{S}^2$. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **28** (2010), 607–615.
[65] Hang, F.B., Yang, P.C. Q-curvature on a class of 3 manifolds. To appear in Comm. Pure Appl. Math.
[66] ——: Q curvature on a class of manifolds of dimension at least 5. `arXiv:1411.3926`.
[67] ——: Sign of Green's function of Panetiz operators and the Q curvature. `arXiv:1411.3924`.
[68] Hebey, E.: Changements de métriques conformes sur la sphère. Le problème de Nirenberg. Bull. Sci. Math. **114** (1990), 215–242.
[69] Hebey, E., Robert, F.: Asymptotic analysis for fourth order Paneitz equations with critical growth. Adv. Calc. Var. **4** (2011), no. 3, 229–275.
[70] Hebey, E., Robert, F., Wen, Y.: Compactness and global estimates for a fourth order equation of critical Sobolev growth arising from conformal geometry. Commun. Contemp. Math. **8** (2006), no. 1, 9–65.
[71] Ji, M.: Scalar curvature equation on $\mathbb{S}^n$. I. Topological conditions. J. Differential Equations **246** (2009), 749–787.
[72] ——: Scalar curvature equation on $\mathbb{S}^n$. II. Analytic characterizations. J. Differential Equations **246**

(2009), 788–818.
[73] Jin, T., Li,Y.Y., Xiong, J.: On a fractional Nirenberg problem, part I: blow up analysis and compactness of solutions. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), **16** (2014), no. 6, 1111–1171.
[74] ——: On a fractional Nirenberg problem, part II: existence of solutions. To appear in IMRN. arXiv:1309.4666.
[75] Jin, T.; Xiong, J.: A fractional Yamabe flow and some applications. J. Reine Angew. Math. **696** (2014), 187–223.
[76] ——: Sharp constants in weighted trace inequalities on Riemannian manifolds. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **48** (2013), no. 3-4, 555–585.
[77] Juhl, A.: On the recursive structure of Branson's Q-curvature. arXiv:1004.1784.
[78] ——: Explicit Formulas for GJMS-Operators and Q-Curvatures. Geom. Funct. Anal. **23** (2013), no. 4, 1278–1370.
[79] Koutroufiotis, D.: Gaussian curvature and conformal mapping. J. Differential Geom. **7** (1972), 479–488.
[80] Li, J., Li, Y., Liu, P.: The Q-curvature on a 4-dimensional Riemannian manifold (M, g) with $\int_M Q\mathrm{d}V_g = 8\pi^2$. Adv. Math. **231** (2012), no. 3-4, 2194–2223.
[81] Li, Y.Y.: Prescribing scalar curvature on $\mathbb{S}^3$, $\mathbb{S}^4$ and related problems. J. Funct. Anal. **118** (1993), 43–118.
[82] ——: Prescribing scalar curvature on $\mathbb{S}^n$ and related problems. I. J. Differential Equations **120** (1995), 319–410.
[83] ——: Prescribing scalar curvature on $\mathbb{S}^n$ and related problems. II. Existence and compactness. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **49** (1996), 541–597.
[84] ——: Remark on some conformally invariant integral equations: the method of moving spheres. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **6** (2004), 153–180.
[85] Lieb, E.H.: Sharp constants in the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev and related inequalities. Ann. of Math. (2) **118** (1983), 349–374.
[86] Lin, L., Liu, Z.: Multi-bump solutions and multi-tower solutions for equations on $\mathbb{R}^N$. J. Funct. Anal. **257** (2009), 485–505.
[87] Malchiodi, A.: The scalar curvature problem on $\mathbb{S}^n$: an approach via Morse theory. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **14** (2002), 429–445.
[88] Malchiodi, A., Struwe, M.: Q-curvature flow on $\mathbb{S}^4$. J. Differential Geom. **73** (2006), no. 1, 1–44.
[89] Moser, J.: On a nonlinear problem in differential geometry. Dynamical systems (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Bahia, Salvador, 1971), pp. 273–280. Academic Press, New York, 1973.
[90] Ndiaye, C.B.: Constant Q-curvature metrics in arbitrary dimension. J. Funct. Anal. **251** (2007), no. 1, 1–58.
[91] Qing, J., Raske, D.: On positive solutions to semilinear conformally invariant equations on locally conformally flat manifolds. Int. Math. Res. Not. (2006), Art. ID 94172, 20 pp.
[92] ——: Compactness for conformal metrics with constant Q curvature on locally conformally flat manifolds. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **26** 2006, no. 3, 343–356.
[93] Robert, F.: Positive solutions for a fourth order equation invariant under isometries. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **131**, no. 5 (2003), 1423–1431.
[94] Robert, F.: Admissible Q-curvatures under isometries for the conformal GJMS operators. Nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations. Contemp. Math., 540, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.
[95] Ros-Oton, X., Serra, J.: The Pohozaev identity for the fractional Laplacian. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **213** (2014), 587-628.

[96] ——: Local integration by parts and Pohozaev identities for higher order fractional Laplacians. arXiv:1406.1107.
[97] Schneider, M.: Prescribing scalar curvature on $\mathbb{S}^3$. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **24** (2007), 563–587.
[98] ——: The scalar curvature equation on $\mathbb{S}^3$. J. Funct. Anal. **257** (2009), 2840–2863.
[99] Schoen, R.: Courses at Stanford University, 1988, and New York University,1989.
[100] Schoen, R., Zhang, D.: Prescribed scalar curvature on the n-sphere. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **4** (1996), 1–25.
[101] Stein, E.: "Singular integrals and differentiability properties of function." Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30 Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1970.
[102] Wei, J., Xu, X.: Prescribing Q-curvature problem on $\mathbb{S}^n$. J. Funct. Anal. **257** (2009), 1995–2023.
[103] ——: On conformal deformations of metrics on $\mathbb{S}^n$. J. Funct. Anal. **157** (1998), 292–325.
[104] Wei, J., Yan, S.: Infinitely many solutions for the prescribed scalar curvature problem on $\mathbb{S}^n$. J. Funct. Anal. **258** (2010), 3048–3081.
[105] Weinstein, G.; Zhang, L.: The profile of bubbling solutions of a class of fourth order geometric equations on 4-manifolds. J. Funct. Anal. **257** (2009), no. 12, 3895–3929.
[106] Xu, X.: Uniqueness theorem for integral equations and its application. J. Funct. Anal. **247** (2007), no. 1, 95–109.
[107] Yang, R.: On higher order extensions for the fractional Laplacian. arXiv:1302.4413.
[108] Zhang, L.: Harnack type inequalities for conformal scalar curvature equation. Math. Ann. **339** (2007), 195–220.
[109] Zhu, M.: Liouville theorems on some indefinite equations. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **129** (1999), 649–661.
[110] ——: Prescribing integral curvature equation. arxiv:1407.2967.

T. Jin
Department of Mathematics, The University of Chicago
5734 S. University Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA
Email: tj@math.uchicago.edu

Y.Y. Li
Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University
110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA
Email: yyli@math.rutgers.edu

J. Xiong
Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University
Beijing 100871, China
Email: jxiong@math.pku.edu.cn